

THE SWORD OR THE CROSS

BY

KIRBY PAGE

THE SWORD OR THE CROSSPART ONE: MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EFFECTS OF THE WAR.I. Good Effects

- (1) The challenge of war has produced a deeper spirit of unselfishness, generosity, consecration, and self-sacrifice.
- (2) Participation in war has created in many a vital, living faith in God, and for others has intensified the reality of the Christian experience.
- (3) The war has increased Christian unity and vitality in the churches.
- (4) The Allies have held back an autocratic militarism.

II. Evil Effects.

- (1) The war has ^{aroused} revived primitive and barbarous passions, and has tended to destroy the sanctity of human life.
- (2) It has increased vice.
- (3) It has made the doctrine of Military Necessity the highest law of conduct, and has tended to dim moral perception.
- (4) It has tended to destroy freedom of belief and action.
- (5) It has ^{increased the} ~~produced a~~ feeling of national self-righteousness.
- (6) It has tended to destroy faith - in ideals, in man, in God.

84315

Disciples Collection

Bibliothèque
Library

Wd. J

PART TWO: THE WAY OF THE CROSS

I. Jesus and the Way of the Cross.

- (1) The Environment of Jesus.
 - (a) Roman Rule of Palestine.
 - (b) The Messianic Hope.
- (2) The Mission of Jesus.
 - (a) The Revelation of God.
 - (b) The Inauguration of the Kingdom of God.
 - (c) The Revelation of the reality of ^{sin} and the redemption ^{man} from ~~sin~~.
- (3) The Method of Jesus.
 - (a) Methods He Declined.
 - (b) The Cross.

II. The Individual and the Way of the Cross.

- (1) The Supremacy of the Cross.
- (2) The Practicability of the Cross.

III. The Church and the Way of the Cross.

- (1) Mistakes of the Church.
- (2) A Positive Message.
 - (a) Refuse to sanction any method that violates the way of the Cross.
 - (b) Adopt and follow an active, heroic, and sacrificial principle of redeeming love.
 - (c) Have faith.

P R E F A C E

That which is contained herein is the outgrowth of the writer's personal experience, observation and reflection in France, England, Scotland and Wales during eight months of the Great War. It has been his rare privilege to be a guest in the homes of professors, clergymen, missionaries and editors, and to receive the benefit of their impressions regarding the war. He has also had the opportunity of discussing this question with Christian leaders from such distant fields as China and India, Australia and South Africa - chaplains, Y. M. C. A. secretaries, Red Cross workers - who have given up for the time being their vocations in these lands in order to participate in some phase of war service. He has listened to expressions of opinion from persons of widely differing stations in society: bankers and dock workers, college students and hotel porters, Christian mothers and unfortunate girls of the street. He has had an opportunity to read the utterances of various clergymen, educators, labor leaders and politicians: pacifists, militarists and otherwise.

Not least of his privileges has been the opportunity of visiting ^{British & American} scores of military and naval training camps, hospitals and convalescent wards, and of talking with hundreds of men from every branch of the service - infantry, cavalry, machine guns, heavy artillery, flying corps, army service corps, torpedo destroyers and battleships; many of whom have seen months of service in Flanders, France, Egypt, Gallipoli, Mesopotamia and East Africa.

The convictions expressed herein are the result of much reflection during these months of opportunity and crisis, and represent an almost complete change of attitude with regard to the ethics of war, and are set forth here as an effort to stimulate others to serious thought upon this important subject.

PART ONE: MORAL AND RELIGIOUS EFFECTS OF THE WAR.

Not within this present century will it be fully known how vast are the changes being wrought by the Great War. Today we stand too near this gigantic struggle to appreciate all that is involved. That it is shaking the very foundations of much that we hold valuable is clear to all, but what the ultimate effects are to be none can tell save the historian of another century.

Recognizing our utter inability to deal comprehensively with the vast ranges of this question, we shall confine ourselves to certain observations with reference to the immediate moral and religious effects of the war. As important as they are, we shall not attempt, in this discussion, to deal with the economic or political results of the present conflict.

I. Good Effects.

(1) Undoubtedly, the challenge of war has produced a new spirit of unselfishness, generosity, consecration and self-sacrifice on the part of thousands of men and women. It is to be doubted whether in all history there has been a more magnificent display of this spirit by such large numbers of people than in the present hour of conflict. Countless numbers of young men at the call of country have gladly given up their all - position, prospect, home, loved ones - in their eagerness to serve King and Country. Older men have willingly given material possessions and only sons as their contribution to the common cause. We found a dock worker, aged 67, who had one son in the army in India, one in Egypt, three in France and one lying wounded in the hospital, and who had just lost his wife, whose death was hastened by worry over her boys. There the old man was, all alone, earning his few shillings a day, but he told us with a smile that he was glad "to do his bit". The spirit of this old man is characteristic of the attitude of great masses of men today.

Words fail us when we attempt to describe the sacrificial spirit that has prompted mothers and wives to urge their sons and husbands to answer the call of duty, knowing full well that it might mean years of bereavement and loneliness. We have been filled with awe and emotion as we have watched farewell scenes at the railway stations. Here is a member of the Royal Flying Corps just off for the front; his wife is bidding him good-bye with a smile, as she holds the baby close to her heart. Not a tear nor a sign of grief, although their hearts must be aching and nearly breaking. It may be that she will go through life a lonely widow and that the little baby will never know a father's love and care. And yet by hundreds of thousands they are gladly, if sadly, giving husbands and sons for the sake of country and humanity.

When we were in the home of a well known missionary from India, whose only son was a young officer in charge of a machine gun squad on the Somme, the boy's mother quietly remarked: "We had planned that he should return to India after Oxford, but we believe that he is best serving God by being at the front, and we are happy that he has responded to the call." We spent some weeks in touring the military camps with the principal of one of the Christian colleges in China. Likewise, his only son was at the front. One could not but be moved with deep emotion at the heroic spirit shown by this boy's mother. These mothers and wives are wonderful, wonderful!

When they are so willing to give their dearest ones, naturally they do not hesitate to give themselves. And so we find them doing every kind of work in every conceivable place. As near to the firing line as possible, they go to minister to the wounded and dying. "God bless you, nurse" has been the feeble whisper of many dying lads. Gipsy Smith tells of having seen titled ladies, in rubber boots, plodding about the camps near the front, with the mud half way to their knees, seeking to serve the men in khaki. In countless ways, these noble women are quietly and humbly giving themselves for the boys at the

front - serving food and refreshments at the rest huts, writing letters to home folks, cheering the lonely and helping the tempted.

Not only at the front, but in every walk of life, the women are cheerfully bearing the heavy burdens occasioned by the absence of the men. In factories and shops, in railway stations and offices, in fields and streets - everywhere, by their faithfulness and efficiency, they are astonishing the world. No task is too humble, difficult or monotonous if by means of it they can serve the common cause. It is almost impossible to exaggerate when speaking of the wonderful heroism and boundless self-sacrifice shown by the womanhood of the belligerent nations.

The way in which thousands of men have freely given their lives on the battlefield for their comrades is beyond all praise. Again and again men have gone to certain death that the lives of others might be saved. Out of all the countless number of such cases, we mention three as being typical of the spirit shown by the men at the front.

The first is the story of Captain M. G. Chavasse, son of the Bishop of Liverpool. Utterly regardless of the heavy fire, he rushed across the open and began to dress the wounded, his promptness undoubtedly preventing many of them bleeding to death. While doing this dangerous work he was wounded in the side by a shell splinter. This injury he sustained while carrying an urgent case into safety. Afterwards at night he took up a party of twenty volunteers, rescued three wounded men from a shell hole only twenty-five yards from the enemy's trench, buried the bodies of two officers, and collected many identification discs - and these things he did although he was fired on by machine guns and bombs. Besides these acts Chavasse for four hours had searched for wounded on the ground in front of the enemy's lines. In all he saved the lives of twenty wounded men, apart from the ordinary cases which passed through his hands; and his courage and self-sacrifice were beyond praise.

Sapper Wm. Hackett afforded another glorious example of self-sacrifice. The explosion of an enemy's mine entombed him and four others in a gallery. For twenty hours these five prisoners, battling with sliding earth, menaced by a horrible death, worked to free themselves, and at the end of that long period they had succeeded in making a hole through the fallen earth and broken timber and had the joy of meeting the outside party and seeing salvation just at hand. Hackett helped three of his fellow-prisoners through the hole. He could easily have followed and secured his own safety; but the fourth man had been seriously injured and the gallant sapper refused to leave him. "I'm a tunneller", he said, "I must look after the others first." The hole was getting smaller, the peril was growing, yet the sapper resolutely refused to leave his injured comrade - then the gallery collapsed and the two were again buried alive. For four days the rescue party worked desperately in their attempt to reach the two men; but they failed. It is hard to find words that adequately expression appreciation of such an act of courage and self-sacrifice. Sapper Hackett, well knowing the nature of the sliding earth, the chances against him, deliberately gave his life for his comrade.

Lieutenant George E. Cates was engaged with some other men in deepening a captured trench, when with his spade, he struck a buried bomb. The bomb immediately began to burn, whereupon Cates, with the noble purpose of saving the lives of his comrades, unhesitatingly placed his foot on the bomb. There was an almost instant explosion, and Cates was killed; but his swift decision and resolute courage saved the lives of the others.

During these months, multitudes of men and women have risen above self-seeking and have given all they have and are for the sake of others. They have learned to follow an ideal without regard to personal discomfort or loss, to live or die that the world may be made a better place in which to dwell, and to save their children from the oppression of militarism and the horrors of war. That this spirit of self-sacrifice

and loyalty to an ideal as abroad in the land is one of the most significant features of the war. Its effects upon posterity cannot be measured.

(2) This war has created in many a vital, living faith in God and has tended to intensify the reality of the Christian experience for others. This is what we might naturally expect. History bears testimony to the fact that any great upheaval or disaster - anything that shakes men out of the conventional routine, that brings new and terrifying experiences, that causes men to realize their utter helplessness in the face of overwhelming danger: whether it be famine, pestilence, earthquake, shipwreck or war - is accompanied by a revival of natural religion of greater or lesser intensity. By natural religion we mean an instinctive turning to a higher power in time of peril and crying out to this power for deliverance. In the midst of the charge, in the face of the murderous fire of the enemy's guns, when opposed by liquid-fire and poison-gas, with comrades falling to the right and left; and when oppressed by the feeling that one's last moment has come, man's natural, instinctive and rational reaction is to call upon a power higher than himself. The battle front has been the scene of many prayers uttered by lips unaccustomed to call upon God in calmer and less dangerous moments.

Out of this experience has come a multitude of fatalists - men who are absolutely certain that they will not go until the particular bullet or piece of shrapnel that is intended for them comes over, and when it does come nothing can save them. "As far back as August 1915 the inventor of a 'special charm for soldiers' informed the Times that he had sold one million and a quarter of these since the war broke out, and gave the public the benefit of this letter, received with five signatures from the front: 'We have been out here for five months fighting in the trenches, and have not had a scratch. We put our good fortune down to your lucky charm, which we treasure highly.'"

The very presence of death in the midst of them is making men think upon the question of immortality. When a man's friends by the score are daily passing on into the Great Beyond, and when he knows that his own time may come at any moment, inevitably he begins to reflect upon the future life.

While the instinctive turning to God in time of peril, the feeling of confidence that one will not be killed until his time has come, and the meditation upon the future life, do not in most cases constitute a real Christian experience, they do tend to make men more susceptible to the Christian message. In theological terms, if these men are not "saved", they are at least "salvable". If the Church only rises to her opportunity, multitudes of these men may be led into a vital Christian experience.

But we can go further and say that many men have actually found God in the trenches. Scores of men have told us that this was their experience. One man who had won the Distinguished Conduct Medal, the Military Medal, and the Russian Order of St. George, told us that when he heard his dying companion cry out "My God!", he was so sobered and impressed that it was the means of his finding God. With many men this faith in God remains as a permanent reality long after the battle is over and undoubtedly has completely changed the lives of many of them.

More than this, hundreds of men who were Christians before the war have, by the terrible experiences undergone, had their faith in God wonderfully strengthened and deeply intensified. As they have seen their comrades overcome not only by the enemy's fire but by the fierce onslaught of temptation and sin, they have been made to realize their utter dependence upon the Almighty God. As the conventional props of morality have fallen one by one, they have learned that safety comes only by leaning on the Everlasting Arms.

While we do not believe it can be said that there has been a revival of the Christian religion at the front, we are

quite certain that many men have found God out there and that still others have had their Christian faith and experience deepened and made more real. Surely this is one of the good results of the war.

(3) The war has tended to increase Christian unity and vitality in the churches. While, of course, it cannot be held that it has produced a feeling of unity among the churches on the opposing sides of this conflict, it is certainly bringing the churches within the separate nations closer together. The various sections within the Anglican Church, the different denominations of Non-Conformity, and even the Roman Catholics have come to feel that the differences between the churches are not the fundamentals of Christianity, but rather that the essence of Christianity consists of those doctrines upon which there is general unanimity of belief. Consequently, there is less tendency to emphasize differences and more eagerness to stress fundamentals upon which there is general agreement. The following observation by an Irish officer bears witness to this fact: "My battalion is composed of North of Ireland men, all Protestants and practically all farm labourers. The men have set aside greatly their church conventions and are broader minded than in pre-war days and are now on a feeling of good fellowship with Souther Roman Catholics, a thing undreamt of before the war. They judge a man not by his outward religion but by his conduct and his comrades and his conduct in action."

There is a new bond of sympathy among the churches in the Allied countries, a notable example of which may be found in the changed attitudes toward each other of the Anglican Church and the Greek Orthodox Church of Russia. Just how significant is this changed relationship remains to be seen, but that some good will come from it can hardly be questioned.

The realization that a divided and crippled Church cannot conquer the forces of evil has been a powerful stimulus to unity of action. In the midst of such a fury of human sin, it is becoming apparent that even a united Church is going to

have a terrific struggle before she wins over the forces of darkness. It is being realized that the religion of conventionality and good form does not appeal to the soldier. A more vital and heart-searching message is demanded. The Christian Church is in the fiery furnace. Much that is dross is being destroyed. Just what effect the refiner's fire will have upon the Church cannot yet be determined, but there is some ground for hope. Not organic unity but a unity of spirit and purpose seems to be coming out of the experiences of these months.

(4) Large numbers of men believe that the most beneficial result of the war will be a negative one, viz., the holding back of an autocratic militarism and the preservation of human freedom. In the minds of those of us who hold the ideals for which the Allies are fighting, a victory by the Central Powers would mean the destruction of much that we hold valuable. From the standpoint of morals and religion - which is our only concern in this particular discussion - it cannot be denied that world domination by a militaristic autocracy would be most deadening and demoralising. To us it appears that life under those conditions would lose much of its attractiveness. There have been times when people submitted to bondage and accepted the code of morals and the kind of religion that was superimposed upon them by military dictators. That day has gone. We insist on following our own standard of morals and our own interpretation of religion.

If a victory for the Allies stems the tide of militarism and autocracy and tends to promote freedom of belief and conduct, who shall say that it is not worth all that it has cost in treasure and human life?

II Evil Effects

We wish it were not necessary to mention this side of the war. We would like to be able to say that all of its effects are uplifting, purifying and ennobling. Our natural inclination is to be optimistic and to lay emphasis upon the more cheerful aspects of any situation, and this desire is increased under the present circumstances by our fear of increasing the sorrow in the heart of any mother or wife, or of being understood as casting reflections upon those brave men who have sacrificed all for a noble cause. Truth, however, compels us to set forth the bad side of war, as unpleasant as it may be. Our only purpose in the succeeding paragraphs is to give the actual facts as they have come under our observation or within our knowledge.

(1) This war has brought a revival of primitive and barbarous passions - hatred, retaliation, cruelty, lust - and has tended to destroy the sanctity of human life. It has torn away the thin veneer of civilization and has revealed the bestial and savage instincts in humanity that some of us fondly imagined had long since been outgrown.

Hymns of hate have been sung ^{by both sides} with as deadly intent as the war song of any cannibal tribe, and our generation has witnessed deeds of barbarity not exceeded by head hunters in forest jungles. Cruelty and lust have been allowed to go unrestrained in all their naked fury. And because of increased knowledge and power, the combatants in this war have wrought havoc upon the enemy in a way that puts to shame the puny efforts of primitive people. Where has there ever been a more wanton demolition of material possessions and a more brutal destruction of human life than in the conquered territory of this war? What words can describe conditions in Belgium, Northern France, Armenia, Poland, Serbia, Roumania? Villages and towns have been pillaged and then burned to the ground, men have been horribly mutilated and left to die in agony, helpless women and girls have been subjected to brutalities and indecencies far more terrible than death.

If the facts were fully known, the following incidents could be multiplied a thousand fold: "When I was last in France", says Dr. R. J. Campbell, "some of our soldiers informed me of finding in certain bloody, filthy Prussian trenches they had taken, no less than 19 French and Belgian women and girls. Most of them were in a dying condition, some had lost their reason."¹ "In one case", writes J. H. Morgan, "the facts of which are proved by evidence which would satisfy any court of law, a young girl of 19 was violated by one officer while the other held the mother by the throat and pointed a revolver; after which the two officers exchanged their respective rolls. The public has been shocked by the evidence which tells of such mutilations of women and children as only the Kurds of Asia Minor had been thought capable of perpetrating."²

Truth compels us to admit, however, that all the hatred and cruelty has not been confined to one set of combatants in this war. In the nature of the case, an invading army always wrecks more buildings, kills more civilians and rapes more women - their opportunity is infinitely greater. Such has undoubtedly been true in the present struggle. The Germans have ^{been} incomparably ^{been} the chief sinners and their conduct is absolutely inexcusable. But can anyone who has been associated with the soldiers of the other side and who is at all familiar with conditions in the Allied countries fail to see that the spirit of revenge and cruelty is often present, however much restraint may be shown due to lack of opportunity?

Probably no prisoners-of-war have been compelled to live in more unsanitary and horrible conditions and have undergone more terrible suffering than have the Germans in certain prisons of the Allied countries. The truth of this statement will be verified when the facts in the case are more fully known to the public, perhaps many years in the future.

Again and again we have been told by Allied soldiers that in their companies it was quite clearly understood that

¹ In "With Our Troops at the Front", p. 2.

² In "German Atrocities", p. 57.

no German prisoners were to be taken, that in the heat of battle the only safe thing to do with a German who wanted to surrender was to run him through with the bayonet, that dead Germans were far less troublesome and dangerous than live German prisoners. One statement to this effect was made by a young lieutenant while we were at the breakfast table of his uncle, a major in the army and a very prominent Christian layman. He was not rebuked.

Mr. F ---, a Christian man, a member of a London volunteer home defense reserve, related his experiences at a lecture on bombing given by an H. O. O. to their company: "The first principle of ^a bombing party is to take no prisoners. You are out to kill and only to kill. If you see a wounded German, kill him for he may shoot you in the back."

A friend of the present writer, a man giving full time to Christian work with the soldiers, tells of being present at a lecture by a major to a squad of recruits. The subject of the discussion was bayonet work, and the following problem was placed before the squad for solution: "Suppose in the thick of battle an enemy should fall down at your feet and cry out, 'Save me, I have a wife and seven children', what should you do?" After considerable discussion, the major himself gave the correct solution of the problem: "Run him through with your bayonet; if you don't he may have seven more children!" The major was not a German officer.

The world has been filled with horror at the thought of German air raids on open towns and cities. A more damnable and devilish practice than dropping high explosives on schools and churches, killing and maiming helpless and innocent women and children, could hardly be imagined. The writer has witnessed three Zeppelin raids and the ~~two~~ largest two aeroplane raids on London at very close range, and speaks from experience. It is hellish business!

But has this infernal practice of bombing the cities of the enemy been confined to Germany? In the House of Commons, on June 5, 1917, Mr. Bonar Law, spokesman for the British War

*If varied
experiences
with Germans
have produced
this conviction
is I may
be sure
F.I.A.*

Cabinet, in referring to the recent raid on Folkestone, pointed out that "many places in the occupation of at least equal importance had been constantly bombed. Zeebrugge alone had been bombed 24 times in April and May, over 1000 bombs being dropped."¹ Again speaking in the House of Commons, Mr. Bonar Law, on June 19th, said: "As I have already stated in answer to a previous question, it would be a mistake to assume that air raiding is confined to the enemy."²

Commenting upon the British Official Report that the Royal Naval Air Service had bombed Constantinople, the London Star, of July 11, 1917, says: "This is only the last of a series of daring air raids on the Turkish capital. As long ago as August 1915, an Allied fleet of aeroplanes flew over Constantinople and dropped bombs on Galata, the suburb on the north side of the Golden Horn, destroying houses and causing heavy casualties. On January 1, 1916, it was reported that a French aeroplane had destroyed the Krupp Munition Factory in the Haskeni quarter of Constantinople, causing explosions and a destructive fire by which half of the Haskeni quarter was reduced to ashes. In April 1916, a raid on Constantinople was carried out by three naval aeroplanes. Bombs were dropped on the Zeitunlik powder factory and the aeroplane hangars. In March of the present year detachments of Russian seaplanes dropped 50 bombs on the aqueduct which supplies Constantinople with water."

The communique issued by the French Ministry of War, on June 21, 1917, contains the following information: "During the period June 6-20 our air squadrons carried out numerous raids and bombarded, notably, the railway station of Bensdorf, the factories of Hayange, Joeuf, and Moyeuve and of the Sarre Valley, the railway station of Betheniville, Chatelet-sur-Retourne, Reithel, Mezieres, and Charleville, Molsheim, Bivouacs

¹ Evening Standard, June 5, 1917.

² Daily Mail, June 19, 1917.

Would you justify indifference to the Krupp factory which would later destroy - it was not a defenseless town -

Zeebrugge is a military base & sea marine most F.I.H.

I am not sure that the allies have bombed cities indiscriminately. My thought is that they attack areas of military or naval importance.

in the valley of the Suipe, ammunition dumps in the region of Leon, etc. Thirteen thousand kilogrammes (13 tons) of bombs were dropped during these expeditions, which inflicted important damage on the enemy establishments."¹

In the London Times of July 10, 1917, we find this information: "Of the 84 aeroplanes which took part in the French reprisal air raid on the night of July 6-7 only two failed to return to their base. Of the four which had Essen as their objective, one managed to complete the whole journey, but the other three all had a most useful share in the general object of the raid, the bombardment of railway stations, munition factories, and gun-emplacements in and round Treves, Coblenz and Ludwigshafen.. Sergeant Gallois, the hero of the Essen expedition, has been recommended for the Military Cross.. Above Essen he began circling round looking for the districts where the lights of workshops were densest on which to drop his bombs. Then he let drop his ten bombs, one after the other, at intervals of ten seconds, though he was unable to make sure of their effect owing to the glare from the factory chimneys."

Concerning Italian operations in the air, the London Times of July 20, 1917, says: "In retaliation for the air raids by Austrians on Avolna, an Italian squadron of 21 aeroplanes on the 16th bombarded enemy positions in Albania, while 18 seaplanes dropped two tons of high explosives over Durazzo, wrecking hangars, quays and other defensive works. Three large machines shelled the camp at Berat, killing many of the troops and destroying stores and war material. All the machines returned safely." Again, the Sunday Times of July 29th further reports: "On the evening of the 27th one of the Italian airships effectively bombed the railway between St. Lucia and Pazzo di Modra, and the Opicina military works were damaged by our aeroplanes. This morning a large flight, with an escort of chasers, dropped nearly three tons of high explosive on the electric power station at Idria and on hutments in Chiapovana Valley."

¹ London Times, June 22, 1917;

Are the English, French, Russian and Italian aviators so accurate in their bomb dropping that, from a height of several thousand feet, they never miss their target and accidentally hit a school or church, killing innocent women and children?

We are not attempting to say that the war has revived these barbarous passions in all soldiers. We do not believe it has. Nor are we trying to show that both sides are equally guilty in these respects. We do not believe they are. The statement which we believe cannot be denied, however, is that this war has been the occasion for the releasing of much hatred, retaliation, cruelty and lust on the part of large numbers of men on both sides of the line. Is it not also true that many men - Germans, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Russians - have been guilty of acts of cruelty and lust they would never have dreamed of performing under normal conditions? Has not war been the means of turning quiet, peace-loving men - from the various nations - into veritable demons in human form, capable of any cruelty or atrocity? Is the doctrine of "frightfulness" the cause of war, or is war the cause of much "frightfulness"? Is the German naturally cruel and vindictive, or does the very pressure of war make him so? "Remember what was said by an Englishman in high command in time of peace and in cool blood, not in time of war when rendered desperate, as perhaps the Germans now are by the pressure of powerful enemies. Said Lord Fisher in 1910, 'If I am in command when the war breaks out, I shall issue as my orders:

'The essence of war is violence.

Moderation in war is imbecility.

Hit first, hit hard, and hit anywhere!

'If you rub it in both at home and abroad that you are ready for instant war with every unit of your strength in the first line, and intend to be first in and hit your enemy in the belly and kick him when he is down, and boil his prisoners in oil (if you take any!), and torture his women and children, then people will keep clear of you! The speaker may have had his tongue in his cheek, but he puts with grim humour the fact that war

cannot be humanized, and that retaliation, doing the same to the enemy, or a bit worse, if you can, is of the essence of both war and reprisals."¹

Whatever else may be true or false, it cannot be denied that the method of warfare does much to bring into expression man's bestial passions and to lead him to indulge in acts of violence and atrocity.

This being so, it naturally follows that war tends to destroy the sanctity of human life. Its very nature makes this true, for its purpose is the destruction of the enemy. Military success is measured by the amount of damage inflicted. How can a man keep his reverence for human life in the midst of a modern battle? In proportion to the ability of a non-combatant to draw a vivid mental picture of warfare as it is now waged, will the difficulty of answering this question press in upon him. Even cold type is able to speak with feeling when describing a battle like Verdun, the Somme, Pozieres or Messines.

"The German is obviously turning on more batteries. Huge black clouds shoot into the air from various parts of the foreground, and slowly drift away across the hill-top. Suddenly there is a descending shriek, drawn out for a second or more, coming terrifying near; a crash far louder than the nearest thunder; a colossal thump to the earth which seems to move the whole world about an inch from its base; a scatter of flying bits and all sorts of under-noises, a rustle of flying wood splinter, whirl of fragments, scatter of falling earth. Before it is half finished another shriek exactly similar is coming through it. Another crash - apparently right on the crown of your head, as if the roof beams of the sky had been burst in. You can just hear, through the crash, the shriek of a third and a fourth shell as they come tearing down the vault of heaven -

¹ quoted by Rev. Henry Dawtre, in "Reprisals", p. 8.

crash, crash. Clouds of dust are floating over you. A swifter shriek and something breaks like a glass bottle in front of the parapet, sending its fragments slithering low overhead. It bursts like a rainstorm, sheet upon sheet, smash, smash, smash. Now he would send them crashing in on a line south of the road - eight heavy heavy shells at a time, minute after minute, followed up by burst upon burst of shrapnel. Now he would place a curtain straight across this valley or that, till the sky and landscape were blotted out, except for fleeting glimpses seen as through a line of fog. Gas shell, musty with chloroform; sweet-scented tear shell that made your eyes run with water; high bursting shrapnel with black smoke and a vicious high explosive rattle behind its heavy pellets; ugly green bursts the color of a fat silkworm.¹

A quotation from Philip Gibbs, the noted war correspondent, lends vividness to the scene: "Horrible to the unfortunate soldiers of the Germany Army is the devilish punishment inflicted upon them during the past ten days, culminating on that day of battle when every weapon for the slaughter of men, from the heaviest of high explosives to boiling oil and gas shells, was let loose upon them in one great tempest of destruction, which blew them out of the earth, and frizzled them, and blinded them, and choked them, and mutilated them, and made them mad."

Or again, listen to Donald Hankey: "You who sit at home and read of glorious bayonet charges do not realize what it means to the man behind the bayonet. You don't realize the repugnance for the first thrust - a repugnance which has got to be overcome. You don't realize the change that comes over a man when his bayonet is wet with the blood of his first enemy. He 'sees red'. The primitive 'blood-lust', kept under all his life by the laws and principles of peaceful society, surges through his being, transforming him, maddening him with the desire to kill, kill, kill! Ask any one who has been through

¹ C. W. E. Bean, "Letters from France".

it if this is not true. And that letting loose of a primitive lust is not going to be without its effect on a man's character."¹

To round out the picture, we quote the words of a young officer: "It is hideously exasperating to hear people talking the glib common-places about the war and distributing cheap sympathy to its victims. Perhaps you are tempted to give them a picture of a leprous earth, scattered with the swollen and blackening corpses of hundreds of young men. The appalling stench of rotting carrion mingled with the sickening smell of exploded lyddite and ammonal. Mud like porridge, trenches like shallow and sloping cracks in the porridge - porridge that stinks in the sun. Swarms of flies and bluebottles clustering on pits of offal. Wounded men lying in the shell holes among the decaying corpses: helpless under the scorching sun and bitter nights, under repeated shelling. Men with bowels dropping out, lungs shot away, with blinded, smashed faces, or limbs blown into space. Men screaming and gibbering. Wounded men hanging in agony on the barbed wired, until a friendly spout of liquid fire shrivels them up like a fly in a candle. But these are only words, and probably only convey a fraction of their meaning to their hearers. They shudder, and it is forgotten."²

This is war as it actually appears to the combatant, stripped of all its glittering tinsel and martial music. We say that war is hell because we have no stronger word to make use of. Here words cannot describe it. Under such extremely abnormal conditions, men become hardened and callous and it no longer seems such an awful thing to kill a man. Indeed, why should it, when it is for that very purpose you are there!

We are not making the statement that all men who participate in war lose their feeling of the sanctity of human life. Some men do.

¹ In "A Student in Arms (Second Series) p. 65.
² The Nation, June 23, 1917.

(2) The War has Increased Vice. This is what one would naturally expect. How could it be otherwise, with the revival of primitive passions and the breakdown of the feeling of reverence for human life? Crowd men together by thousands, direct their time, energy and thought toward the art of destruction, ^{the} remove all refining influences of home and society, and inevitably there is an appalling lapse into the grosser sins.

It is not enough to say that this condition existed in time of peace, that we simply notice it more because it is concentrated. It is to be doubted whether very many men are living a cleaner moral life than they were in pre-war days. On the other hand, it is unquestionably true that many men have contracted immoral habits during this war. After months of association with soldiers in many camps, the present writer is convinced of the absolute truth of this statement.

Men who before the war were clean in their speech have fallen into depths of the vilest profanity and obscenity. The most unspeakable filth is bandied about from mouth to mouth, and an alarmingly large proportion of men are guilty at this point. The practice of gambling is now indulged in by many men to whom it was no temptation at all in pre-war days.

Beyond question, many men have had their first taste of liquor at the army canteen or public bar near camp. The profits from the military canteens in the English camps go into the regimental funds for the benefit of the officers and men. Hence the size of these funds depends upon the quantity of liquor sold. We have not heard that this custom tends to reduce the consumption of liquor by the soldiers. Several times we have been informed that on special occasions the Command ^{ing} Officers in different camps has closed the Y. M. C. A., the Salvation Army, and the Church Army refreshment counters, and at the same time has permitted the military liquor canteens to remain open for business, leaving these latter places as the only ones to which the soldiers could go for food or refreshments. Of course, this procedure swelled the size of the regimental funds. There

is no report available to indicate the number of men who have had the drink habit fastened on them by the army canteen.

Hundreds of thousands of gallons of rum have been sent out to the trenches. On cold mornings the sergeant serves it to his men. It is especially useful just as the men are going into action, as it tends to make them more ferocious. One cannot refrain, however, from asking the question, How many men will have the same story to tell that we listened to from the lips of a young soldier who had been at the front for fifteen months: "One cold January morning", he said, "when the sergeant was serving the rum ration, I tasted liquor for the first time in my life. After that I took it regularly, and soon came to look forward with eagerness to its arrival. I could hardly get along without my liquor now."

The sad part of it is that thousands of women have taken to drinking since their husbands and fathers went to the front. The following comment bears witness at this point: "At this ~~the~~ season Churchworkers return from their holidays, and many of us who live in East London have been shocked and saddened by finding that drinking among women is on the increase. I found that one whom I did not even know to be intemperate had delirium tremens. A girl told me, 'How mother is never sober'. A man came to beg me to try to rescue his wife. I am told that men are employed to fetch strong drink to the women at 3d. a journey. A working woman who lives in one of our dock districts tells me that as soon as the public-houses are open to women, the wives and mothers assemble in gangs, and spend practically the whole day in drinking."¹

The problem of sexual impurity is a most serious one indeed during this present conflict. We refer not so much to deeds of violence as to the general lowering of the moral standard. So prevalent is this habit among the soldiers that the military authorities simply take it for granted and take necessary steps of precaution. In many camps, every man who goes on

¹ quoted by E. A. Burroughs, in "The Valley of Decision".

leave is furnished with medical preventives, which he is urged to use.

One has only to walk the streets of Paris or London to have the seriousness of this problem brought home to him. Of course, it would be foolish to contend that war is solely responsible for this condition. However, men who were familiar with conditions in the days just preceding the war unreservedly say that there has been a decided change for the worse. Indeed, immorality is much greater now than even during the second year of the war, and conditions are steadily growing worse. Moral conditions are unspeakably bad in France and England, whatever may be the case in Germany and other countries. Without exaggeration, we have seen public prostitutes by the hundred boldly parading on Avenue des Champs-Elysees, Place de l'Opera, Piccadilly Circus and Leicester Square, absolutely unmolested by the police, who confess their inability to deal with the situation under the present laws. Officers and privates by the thousand are nightly going with her "whose way takes hold on hell".

In this connection, we quote the brilliant Donald Hankey: "Consider the fighting man in the trenches - and I am speaking of both officers and men - the most ordinary refinements of life are conspicuously absent. There is no water to wash in. Vermin abound, sleeping and eating accommodations are frankly disgusting. One is obliged for the time to live like a pig. Added to this, one is all the time in a state of nervous tension. One gets very little sleep. Every night has its anxieties and responsibilities. Danger or death may come at any moment. So for a week or a fortnight or a month, as the case may be. Then comes the return to billets, to comparative safety and comfort - the latter nothing to boast about though! Tension is relaxed. Officers and men alike determine to 'gather rosebuds' while they may. Their bodies are fit, their wills are relaxed. If they are built that way, and an opportunity offers, they will 'satisfy the lusts of the flesh'..

Probably most men are immoral. The conditions of military, and especially of active service merely intensify the temptation."¹

Some indication of the alarming prevalence of sexual impurity may be gained from the figures quoted by Captain Guest, in the House of Commons: "During the first 33 months of the war, 97,000 soldiers have been admitted into venereal hospitals in England. In France about 50,000 of our men suffering from the worst form of the disease have passed through British hospitals there, and also between 150,000 and 200,000 lighter cases."² So serious is the problem that King George has appointed a Royal Commission to investigate venereal disease.

If a quarter of a million English soldiers have contracted venereal disease since the outbreak of war, in spite of the highly successful preventive measures, how many men have actually been guilty of sexual impurity?

The problem is not only a serious one from the standpoint of the soldier, it also vitally concerns the womanhood of the land. In the nature of the case, there can be no lowering of moral standards on the part of men that does not inevitably react upon women. It seems to us that in at least three ways this war has tended to bring about a general lowering of moral standards among the womanhood of the land.

In the first place, in the eyes of most young women there is something romantic about a soldier's uniform. No formal introduction is necessary, and young ladies from the very best homes do not hesitate freely to talk with soldiers whose names they do not know and whom they have never seen before. One young officer³ says: "Women and girls, apparently fascinated by the khaki, have flung aside all modesty and restraint and this has acted as a stimulant to materialistic notions, so that now the whole country seethes in immorality." Another officer, a major, has this to say: "The lack of reserve and restraint since the war among women who were previously modest and respectable is an especially conspicuous and regrettable fact."

¹ A Student in Arms (Second Series) p. 64, 68
² London Daily Mail, April 28, 1917.

There is quite a general tendency to let the glamour of heroism hide all moral deficiencies and to condone lapses into immorality on the ground of services rendered at the front.

"Poor chap, he has led a dog's life out in the trenches, and it is no wonder he is a little wild when home on leave. Oh well, he will get over it and settle down when the war is over. Let him have his fun now; he gets little enough at best. I'll tell you, nothing is too good for our brave boys." The actions of many young women from the best homes show that this is about the way in which they regard the whole matter. A red Cross nurse, a fellow of Newnham College, Cambridge, gives this interesting bit of information: "Silly girls have been known, in my own experience, to offer wounded soldiers 6d or 1/ to take them out for a walk. In one town there was a regular tariff for walks, and this provided the men with a constant supply of small cash. The only Highlander in the hospital could command 1/6, while a rather unpleasant cripple was only worth 6d." In more cases than anyone will ever know, this eagerness to please the returned soldier has led to relationships that have culminated in moral disaster.

Another vital factor in this connection has been the crowding together of thousands of women and girls in munition centers, where they are often housed in most unsuitable lodgings. The exacting and exhausting nature of the work, the fact that the making of implements of destruction in itself has a deadening moral effect, the absence of all home influence, and the presence of virulent and aggressive temptation - all these combined have created an atmosphere that has led to the downfall of many young women. While delivering a religious address before a large group of women in a munition center, a certain clergyman was, on three separate occasions, interrupted by loud, vulgar and obscene remarks, which were greeted with unrestrained laughter by the women present.

The abnormal conditions in the homes of soldiers who are at the front is accompanied by grave moral perils. In many

cases the pinch of poverty has driven the wife or daughter over the line. Still others, through sheer loneliness, have gone to public-houses or other gathering places and have formed friendships that have led to lapses into immorality. One has only to talk with the unfortunate girls on the street to discover the final outcome of some of these experiences.

An important by-product of the war is the increase of juvenile delinquency and crime. In this connection, we quote from the record of the Secretary of the Howard Association of London, the object of which association is "to promote efficient methods for the prevention and treatment of crime and juvenile delinquency":¹

"Figures issued by the Home Office show that during the war there has occurred a grave increase in the number of juvenile offenders, and especially of juvenile thieves. For the period covered by these figures the increase in juvenile offences in general is 34 per cent., and the increase in thefts nearly 50 per cent. Juvenile lawlessness has spread through the country like a plague. The most disquieting feature of all these returns ^{is} are not merely that the increase exists, but that it is so much larger in the second year of war than the first. The causes of the present increase in juvenile delinquency are chiefly to be found in the withdrawal from child-life of adult personal influence, and in the curtailment of those social and educational agencies that hitherto have occupied so large a part of the child's life.

"It is useless to deny that war has evoked a spirit of adventure in children; it has excited them, as it has us. Today is the day of the hero - and a boy dearly wishes to be thought a hero. He, too, desires adventures, and no doubt an innocent railway wagon, creeping stealthily through a dark, mean street does sometimes prove to be a German convoy, even as the youngsters prove to be British troops - and the van's contents German supplies, and so legitimate spoils of war! The boy learns it

¹

Cecil Leeson, in "The Child and the War".

is right to do anything to his enemy, and he does it. He is plastic, impressionable, imitative, a mirror to every breath of national feeling. It is scarcely possible to walk among children today and remain unimpressed by the enormous influence exerted by the war on their minds. Moreover, the prevailing war talk, compounded as it largely is of graft, guile, revenge, does not serve to improve matters."

Thus we have seen that war has increased profanity, obscenity, gambling, drunkenness and sexual impurity. We are quite prepared to admit that other practices and conditions than war produce like results. This fact, however, does not affect the truth of our statement that this war has increased vice.

(3) The war has made the Doctrine of Necessity the highest law of conduct, and has tended to ^{dim} moral perception.

Germany quite frankly admits that the invasion of Belgium was an outrage, but contends that no other course was left open to her. Her very existence depended upon striking quickly and furiously at France. It was quite unfortunate that Belgium happened to be in the way, and Germany was quite willing to make reparation for all losses. Such things as treaties and moral obligation count for nothing as compared with the achievement of the desired end.

The Germans fully understand that their submarine warfare is a violation of international law and a damnable outrage upon humanity. But this is of small consequence as compared with the desirability of starving England into surrender or the crippling of her participation in the war. If this cannot be accomplished by means of "civilized" warfare, then try piracy. The end justifies the means.

Because of the exigencies of the military situation, Germany has tolerated, if not encouraged, the most atrocious massacres of Armenians by the Turks. Four members of the German Mission Staff in Turkey wrote to the Imperial German Minister of Foreign Affairs, as follows: "Out of 2,000 to 3,000 peasant

women from the Armenian Plateau who were brought here in good-health, only forty or fifty skeletons are left. The prettier ones are the victims of their gaolers' lust; the plain ones succumb to blows, hunger and thirst. Every day more than a hundred corpses are carried out of Aleppo. All this happens under the very eyes of high Turkish officials. The German scutcheon is in danger of being snatched for ever in the memory of the Near Eastern peoples. We know that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has already, from other sources, received detailed descriptions of what is happening here. But no change has occurred in the system."¹ Why was no protest made, and why was this annihilation allowed to continue? Was it because the German nation was in sympathy with such an outrage? No, it was because a protest might have endangered their relations with Turkey and interfered with "the winning of the war".

The Allies admit that they do not like the task of starving German women and children. Yet this is what would happen if they were entirely successful with their blockade. If starving women and children will bring the war to a successful termination, who can doubt that this is the humane thing to do? Certainly, the end justifies the means. Is not this the logic that is in daily use?

Who started this? Poison Gas?

Do the Allies regard the use of poison-gas and liquid-fire and boiling oil as legitimate methods of warfare? Do they look upon the bombing of open cities as within the bounds of international law? Not if we are to believe one-tenth of what they have said upon these points. Then why are they making constant use of gas, and fire and oil in their attacks, and why have they bombed the enemies' cities far more frequently than is generally recognized by their own people? Simply because of necessity. In the House of Commons, on July 12, 1917, Mr. Peto asked Mr. Bonar Law, as spokesman for the British War Cabinet, "whether in deciding for or against a policy of retaliation for German air attacks on London, the Government would

¹ "The Treatment of Armenians", edited by Viscount Bryce.

would be guided only ^{by} military considerations, and not by sentimental, philosophical and ethical considerations". Mr. Bonar Law replied: "In this matter the Government will be guided only by military considerations."¹ The question as to whether a given practice is moral or immoral does not enter in. The doctrine of necessity holds sway, and the end justifies the means.

Can we not go further and say that the very idea of war involves the acceptance of this theory? Beyond question, the thought of war is absolutely repugnant to the vast majority of men. They participate in it simply because of necessity, as the only means of protecting or preserving what they hold dear. They do not like it, they loathe it! As a last resort, they indulge in it, because to them the end justifies the means.

All of this being so, war tends to dim moral perception and deaden conscience. One has only to recall the horror with which ^{certain} ~~these~~ forms of modern warfare were greeted upon their first appearance in battle, and then to notice how one after the other these condemned practices have been adopted by those nations which were loudest in their tirade against them, to appreciate at least the partial truth of this statement.

Who does not remember the bitter denunciation heaped upon the Germans when first they used poison-gas in the battle of Ypres? Our own feeling is that this practice cannot be denounced too severely. But what is the condition today? The Allies now use poison-gas and liquid-fire with most telling effect in their great drives, as naturally as though these deadly instruments had always been recognized as legitimate in "civilized" warfare. No longer do the Allied generals send home official denunciations of this barbarous method of waging war. Instead, at the first favorable breeze, they issue an order for a gas attack upon the enemy's trenches. The English and French newspapers are not now filling their columns with stories about the "frightfulness" of using poison-gas. Rather, in these same columns are glowing accounts of the number of Germans

¹ London Daily Telegraph, July 13, 1917.

killed and the amount of damage inflicted by the use of these means, in the hands of their dexterous and gallant soldiers. For instance, "At night the enemy pours out a different death mixture in the form of gas-shells, hoping to catch our men without their masks. We retaliate with gas-clouds, which creep into German craters and trenches on a soft west wind, and kill any men who happen to take a breath or two, so that they sleep for ever. ~~xxxxxxx~~ The gloves are off on both sides."²

At this particular point, we are not dealing with the question as to whether this retaliatory practice is justifiable. Our only contention here is that war does tend to dim moral perception and to deaden conscience. Many men are now administering poison-gas with a freedom (of compunction) of conscience that would have been quite impossible some months ago. A friend of the present writer tells of an honor man in chemistry at Oxford who went out to Ceylon as a Christian missionary. One of his outstanding traits of character was his sensitiveness, it being said of him that "he would not even hurt an insect". And yet, at the present time, this man is using all his scientific knowledge in the making of poison-gas for the British War Department.

An investigation of the effect on the English people of the dastardly Zeppelin and aeroplane raids brings forth an appalling amount of evidence to show that war does tend to obscure moral judgment.

Seldom has such a cry of horror and indignation gone up from the world as when the news was first received that Zeppelins had bombed open cities in England. Outside of the Central Empires, there was an almost universal moral protest against this damnable outrage. Nations are still bitter in their denunciation of the practice of dropping bombs on their cities, but they feel much less intensely about bombing the homes of the enemy.

Prior to the raid on London on June 13, 1917, at which
1 Philip Gibbs, in London Daily Telegraph, July 23, 1917.

time there were 600 casualties, including a large number of women and children, there had been spasmodic public efforts to induce the Government to practice reprisals. This raid was the signal for the breaking forth of a perfect avalanche of public opinion demanding reprisals on German cities. The writer was in London at the time and witnessed the raid at close range and saw its terrible effects. Consequently, he was able to gather first-hand information regarding the public attitude toward this outrage.

The leading editorial in the London Observer of June 17, 1917, is to the point here: "A week ago we would have said that public opinion was rather undecided about reprisals - that, in spite of the strong feeling for them, there was perhaps a wavering majority against. It is not so now. The national mind, in its well-known manner, has hardened in a moment. There is an overwhelming, an almost universal demand for reprisals on a scale which shall prevent further devil's work of the same kind. There is no merely vengeful feeling. It is inspired by a just and unsparring wrath which does credit to the clean instincts of our people.. We have had a certain respect for the feeling against reprisals which had hitherto existed. It was not very logical nor very sound. It largely belonged, nevertheless, to high-minded instincts and pure-hearted emotion. Any further indulgence of it would mean moral perversion encouraging further atrocities against our own people, and above all, against the children, whom it is our first duty to defend."

That this editorial did represent a large body of public opinion is shown by the fact that the Lord Mayor of London presided at a mass meeting at the London Opera House on Sunday afternoon, June 17, 1917, called together to demand that the Government institute reprisals. In addressing this meeting the Lord Mayor said: "Whatever course is taken, we must stop this brutal and wholesale murder of women and children. I don't care what measures you adopt so long as these outrages are stopped. We don't want any maudlin sentiment expressed here. We are out with the sole idea of doing justice to and the

protection of our women and children."¹ "The Lord Mayor then moved a resolution expressing the meetings abhorrence of these dastardly and criminal attacks and calling for systematic and ruthless reprisals to bring the cruelty home to the German people."² The audience demanded that a copy of the resolution should be sent to the King and, the resolution being carried, this was agreed to.

Following this mass meeting there was a perfect torrent of editorials and public addresses demanding reprisals. Out of all this mass of expression, we quote briefly from two leading editorials and three or four utterances by public men:

"It is no doubt true", says the London Daily Mail, of June 19, 1917, "that air raids in the past have not been confined to the Germans. But on our side they have not been sufficiently frequent or sufficiently persistent.. We have left the initiative too much in the hands of the Germans. We hope that all this is ended, and there will be very general disappointment throughout the country if it is not. The nation will firmly support the Government in its decision to attack German towns. The professional sentimentalists will, of course, have their say. The present stage of the war, however, is one at which it is hardly necessary to take any notice of them."

"The object of reprisals is not to kill German women and children, but to save our own women and children from being killed. Those who argue in favor of a policy of reprisals are neither un-Christian nor bloodthirsty. They simply favor what is, on general grounds, a policy of common sense. They would prove to the German people, and through the German people to the German Government, that terrorism does not pay. They would, for every bomb dropped on London or any other unfortified British town, rain ten bombs on Cologne and other accessible Rhine cities, in the persuasion that this argument would quickly change the point of view of the average German civilian.. ~~For~~ ~~extant~~ It is, we think, an unfortunate, an unpatriotic, and even an un-Christian attitude which the one-sided humanitarians

London Daily Mirror, June 18, 1917

are adopting. Experience has shown that the only argument against ruthlessness is more ruthlessness."²

The Mayor of Bermondsey makes himself understood in the following statement: "There is no doubt as to the feeling of people here. At a meeting attended by 4,000 people, the proposal for reprisals was received with vociferous approbation, and something definite will have to be done in the matter. What is warfare but a series of reprisals? We must have them in the air as well as on the land and sea, and show the Germans that it will be to their advantage to stop sending their murderous craft over here."²

"Preaching in Foxley Church, Rev. Harry Lancelot Warneford said that we were told to love our enemies, but that did not mean putting our arms around their necks, and we were told to bless those that persecuted us, which did not mean kissing them. 'To me, he continued, 'it seems that the only way to stop these air raids is for the civilian population of Germany to cry out against them and insist on their being put an end to, which indeed they will never do until they have tasted of the cup themselves and learned by bitter experience that dropping bombs on women and children is not war, but pure and unadulterated murder. Personally, I feel that the hour must come, however much we dislike it, when we must in defense of our own women and children show the Hun that if war is to be carried out on these lines two can play at the same game."⁶

Dr. Russell Wakefield, Bishop of Birmingham, states, in his monthly letter to his clergy, that he is constantly questioned on the subject of reprisals for air raids. "Fighting in the air has become so extended," he says, "that nowadays it is considered legitimate to attack any place that may have soldiers, munitions, or fortifications in it or near it. Just now the German is probably, on land, on and under the sea, and in the air, using the recklessness of semi-despair. He has all along been indifferent to the dictates of ordinary humanity. At one time he poisons by gas, at another he torpedoes a hospital ship. In each revolting case he nevertheless has a military

¹ Evening Standard, June 25. ² Daily News, June 22

⁶ London Star, June 19, 1917.

motive at his beck and call. Surely our course is clear. The last thing in the world we wanted to do was to use poison. We had to do it in self-defense. So with air attacks. We may bomb German towns because most of them are more or less war towns. We cannot distinguish the innocent inhabitants from the rest of the nation. We cannot move our foes to a change of mind except by force. In all this I contend we are not making reprisals for evil done by Germany. We are simply bringing our methods up to the present warfare standard. It is hateful, but it is the shortest way to peace."¹

The Archbishop of Canterbury says: "I get letters in which I am urged to see to it that we insist upon 'reprisals, swift, bloody, and unrelenting. Let gutters run with German blood. Let us smash to pulp the German old men, women and children', and so on."²

Several talks with an English air scout, who had been in the service for many months, gave the writer a sidelight on the attitude of some English airmen. He expressed his opinion in clear terms: "The Germans have a perfect right to raid London. If we can't stop them, it is our loss. The Emperor should give the Iron Cross to every German airman who gets by our defences; if he doesn't the King should award the Victoria Cross. If I were ordered to bomb Berlin, I should aim at the Krupp works, but if I missed and hit a school, I should not grieve; it would simply be a misfortune of war. There is no conscience in war; you are out to kill and destroy."

In an editorial, the London Daily Mail, of June 18, 1917, insists that "the question of attacking German towns is a military one, and is not to be settled by ecclesiastics but by common sense." That is the exact point for which we are contending, namely, morality is sidetracked by the exigencies

¹ London Daily Express, July 2, 1917.

² London Times, June 22, 1917.

of war. In these days large number of men, - soldiers and civilians - have ceased to ask whether a given practice is moral or immoral; there only concern is, Does it pay? Consequently, the world is menaced by an epidemic of moral atrophy.

That this war has tended to obscure moral judgment and deaden conscience is further emphasized in a striking letter from a soldier, which was printed in a leading English periodical some months ago:¹

"It is very nice to be home again", he says. "Yet am I am home? One sometimes doubts it. There are occasions when I feel like a visitor among strangers whose intentions are kindly, but whose modes of thought I neither altogether understand nor altogether approve.. The fact is we've drifted apart.. Between you and us there hangs a veil. It is mainly of your own unconscious creation. It is not a negative, but a positive thing. It is not intellectual, it is moral. It is not ignorance (or I should not mention it). It is falsehood.

"I read your papers and listen to your conversation, and I see clearly that you have chosen to make to yourselves an image of war, not as it is, but of a kind which, being picturesque, flatters your appetite for novelty, for excitement, for easy admiration, without troubling you with with masterful emotions. You have chosen, I say, to make an image, because you do not like, or cannot bear, the truth; because you are afraid of what may happen to your souls if you expose them to the inconsistencies and contradictions, the doubts and bewilderment, which lie beneath the surface of things.

"I can forgive you for representing war as a spectacle instead of a state of existence, for I suppose that to the correspondent who is shepherded into an observation post on a show day it does seem spectacular. But the representation of the human beings concerned is unpardonable. There has been invented a kind of conventional soldier, whose emotions and ideas are those which you find it most easy to assimilate with your coffee and marmalade.. He is represented as invariably

¹ The Nation, Oct. 21, 1916.

'cheerful', as revelling in the 'excitement' of war, as finding 'sport' in killing other men, as 'hunting Germans out of dugouts as a terrier hunts rats', ~~as a terrier hunts rats~~ For the rest, we are depicted as merry assassins, rejoicing in the opportunity of a 'scrap' in which we know that more than three-quarters of our friends will be maimed or killed, careless of our own lives, exulting in the duty of turning human beings into lumps of disfigured clay, light-hearted as children in a garden who shoot at sparrows with a new air-gun and clap their hands when they fall, charmed from the transient melancholy of childhood by a game of football or a packet of cigarettes.

✓ 2. "Of the first material reality of war, from which everything else takes its color, the endless and loathsome physical exhaustion, you say little, for it would spoil the piquancy of the picture. Of your soldiers' internal life, the constant collision of contradictory moral standards, the liability of the soul to be crushed by mechanical monotony, the sensation of taking a profitless part in a game played by monkeys and organized by lunatics, you realize, I think, nothing.. And behind the picture of war given in your papers there sometimes seems to lurk something worse than, yet allied to, its untruthfulness, a horrible suggestion that war is somehow, after all, ennobling; that, if not the proper occupation of man, it is at least one in which he finds a fullness of self-expression impossible in peace; that when clothed in khaki and carrying rifles, these lads are more truly 'men' than they were when working in offices or factories. Perhaps I do you an injustice. But that intimation does seem to me to peep through some of your respectable paragraphs. As I read them I reflect upon the friends who after suffering various degrees of torture died in the illusion that war was not the last word of Christian wisdom. And I have a sensation as of pointed ears and hairy paws and a hideous ape-face grinning into mine - sin upon sin, misery upon misery, to the end of the world."

Anyone at all familiar with the facts cannot deny that the war has so obscured the moral judgment and deadened the conscience of many men that now they defend acts they once condemned, and participate in deeds of violence, the thought of which once filled them with horror.

1915 is not fundamental
national & international morality
receiving an
emphasis such
as never before?

(4) ^{The War} It has tended to destroy freedom of belief and action. We introduce this discussion by quoting from an address delivered by Emperor William of Germany: "Recruits! Before the altar and the servant of God you have given me the oath of allegiance. You are too young to know the full meaning of what you have said, but your first care must be to obey implicitly all orders and directions. You have sworn fidelity to me, you are children of my guard, you are my soldiers. You have surrendered yourselves to me, body and soul. Only one enemy can exist for you - my enemy. With the present Socialist machinations, it may happen that I shall order you to shoot your own relatives, your brothers, or even your parents - which God forbid - and then you are bound in duty implicitly to obey my orders."¹

While other military leaders may use more tact and diplomacy of expression, who can deny that the German Emperor has spoken the real truth about war? Obedience is the foundation stone of military efficiency. The soldier cannot question the judgment of his superior officers, nor can he follow his own conscience with regard to any practice. Compunctions of conscience must not be allowed to interfere with the most implicit obedience of orders. This command may involve the use of poison-gas, the sinking of the Lusitania, the bombing of London or Cologne, or the shooting down of relatives upon the streets of Dublin. The military authorities are the sole judges as to the morality of these acts: the soldier simply executes their decision.

The seriousness of this situation is greatly intensified when we remember that in these days only a very, very

¹ quoted by Upton Sinclair, "The Cry for Justice", p.555.

few men of military age have any choice whatever as to whether or not they shall enter the army. Out of all the combatant nations, only two - Great Britain and the United States - make any exemptions on grounds of conscience. It is officially stated that there are not less than 60,000 priests serving with the belligerents on all fronts - and these exclusive of the priests of the Eastern Church serving with the Russian forces and the thousands of ministers of all denominations serving with the Protestant troops of Great Britain.¹

Although there is a provision for the exemption of conscientious objectors in England, the Tribunals see to it that very few exemptions are allowed. In fact, there have been less than one hundred absolute exemptions on ground of conscience in England during the three years of the war. "A good deal of browbeating, sneering, and abuse has characterized many of the courts, and the conscientious objector has found himself faced with all the hatred, fear and contempt which our kind generally metes out to those who think differently from the rest, or indeed, set themselves to think at all. The effect of refusing exemption to some of these men has been to subject them to persecution of varying degrees; some of them know what it feels like to be under sentence of death, and hundreds have found themselves making an acquaintance with prison life. The general impression is that they are cowards, shirkers, lunatics and freaks, who have sheltered themselves under an unfortunate clause in the Military Service Act. Some have counselled deportation, others shooting, a great many disfranchisement."²

The following quotation from the London Daily Mail, of April 28th, 1917, shows the attitude of many people toward the conscientious objector: "The very name which has been invented for him is the badge of disgrace. The conscience, to which he appeals, is his own and very serviceable. He has trained it to come to heel, like a whipped cur. 'Conscience is a dangerous

¹ quoted by R. J. Campbell, "With Our Troops at the Front" p. 28.

² W. E. Orchard, "The Outlook for Religion", p. 162.

thing: it makes a man a coward', says the poet, thus proving that he possessed the gift of prophecy. For it is cowardice, and cowardice alone, which holds back the 'objector' from the duty imposed upon all decent men. Though he does his best to deceive himself, and the tribunals, his true motive cannot be disguised. He is afraid of discomfort, he is afraid of risk, he is afraid of death. And so he gladly permits his fellows to fight in France, while he stays at home to chatter platitudes, and to thank God that he has risen far above the blatant crime of 'militarism'."

"There have been in prison, under the Military Service Acts, over 3,000 Conscientious Objectors. About 2,000 of these have accepted what is called work of National Importance, under the Home Office Scheme. This work is probably not useless, but it is nearly always something at which the man who is set to it is not skilled, and is, in at least nine cases out of ten, less useful than the work he was accustomed to, and from which the Military Service Act dragged him. There are probably six or seven hundred Conscientious Objectors, who believe that it would be wrong for them to accept this so-called 'work of national importance', and they, on the expiry of their sentences, are returned to the Army, again court-martialled, and again sentenced to a term of imprisonment. Some are now serving a fourth term of imprisonment, a much larger number a second or third term.

"Who are these Absolutists, who are being imprisoned again and again? They are such men as Stephen Hobhouse, who had resigned wealth and position in order to devote themselves wholly to social and religious work. He is still in prison. Others are such well-known Pacifists as Clifford Allen and Fenner Brockway, of the genuineness of whose convictions there can be no doubt. Prominent members of the Society of Friends, who, by the way, most people appear to think are always exempted, such as Roderick Clark, Hubert Peet, Robert O'Mennell, Hugh Gibbins, and Wilfrid Littleboy, most of whom can claim five or six generations of Quaker ancestry, are amongst them."¹

¹ Wm. E. Wilson, in the Nation, March 10, 1917.

Just what the attitude of the United States would be if pressed for men cannot be determined. Officially, no provision has been made for exemption on grounds of conscience, save to members of certain sects whose creeds forbid participation in war. Thanks to her enormous resources of man power, she can afford to be lenient for the present.

Taking into account the facts in all of the belligerent nations, it cannot be denied that this war has for multitudes of men destroyed freedom of belief and action.

(5) The war has increased the feeling of national self-righteousness. For three years now the clergymen in all of the warring nations have been preaching about "the righteousness of our cause", until today there is hardly a dissenting voice. "To us, more than to any other nation", says the eminent Professor Eucken, "is entrusted the true human existence."¹ Dr. Lassen frankly expresses his opinion: "We are morally and intellectually superior, beyond all comparison, as to our organization and institutions."² Professor von Stengel, of Munich, avows at the end of the second year of the war: "The nations, and especially the neutral nations, have only one means of leading a profitable existence. It is to submit to our guidance, which is superior from every point of view. For we not only have the power and force necessary for this mission, but we also possess all the spiritual gifts to the highest degree, and in all creation it is we who constitute the crown of civilization."³

Pastor Lober, of Leipzig, maintains that defending one's country is in itself a righteous act: "Everyone is serving God who makes the blood of an enemy flow, and it is because he is thus serving God that he can reckon on God's blessing. The admonition of the New Testament to return good for evil cannot be applied in war. In war evil must be met by evil, and wherever possible by greater and increased evil. War demands Old Testament severity, not the mildness of the new dispensation. He is to be praised and envied who sees his enemies perish. This is only another side of love for one's country, this desire for ~~xxxxxx~~ ¹ quoted by Geo. D. Herron, in "The Menace of Peace".

revenge on the malicious enemy. We beflag our houses, we ring our bells, and sing 'Now thank we all our God' when countless multitudes of Russians meet a terrible death in the Masurian swamps, or when two thousand seamen are plunged to the bottom of the ocean by our submarines. And such expressions of gratitude and joy are genuinely German and genuinely Christian."¹

So far as we are able to discover, there is no record of the number of times Emperor William has given expression to his passionate conviction that Germany is God's chosen instrument to inflict vengeance upon the unrighteous nations of the earth.

But this feeling is not confined to the German people. It is abroad in all of the nations. Is it difficult to distinguish it in the following communication?²

"Buckingham Palace, Oct. 26, 1914.

My dear Archbishop, (of Canterbury)

The King has lately received numerous communications from different quarters urging upon his Majesty the necessity for a Day of National Humiliation and Prayer. Personally, the King is disinclined to advocate the use of any term which might plausibly be misinterpreted either at home or abroad. At the same time, his Majesty recognizes the national call for united prayer, intercession, thanksgiving and for remembrance of those who have fallen in their country's cause. It seems to the King that the beginning of the year would be a fitting season to be thus solemnized; and his Majesty thinks that Sunday, January 3, might well be the chosen day.

Yours very truly,

Stamfordham."²

On Saturday before this chosen day, the London Times makes this comment: "Originally it seems to have been proposed to call this a "Day of National Humiliation and Prayer". But the King was disinclined to advocate the use of any term which might plausibly be misinterpreted either at home or abroad. There can be no doubt that the whole nation strongly shares his

¹ quoted by R. J. Campbell, "The War and the Soul", p. 61.
² London Times, Nov. 5, 1914.

Majesty's opinion.. On the threefold basis of intercession, thanksgiving and remembrance (no mention of penitence) the movement has been taken up in a heartfelt and reverent spirit throughout the country, not only by members of the Church of England, but also by the ^Lauthorities of the Roman Catholic Church and the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches."¹

The words of the Bishop of Norwich, at Sandringham Church, on the chosen day, in the presence of the King and Queen, Princess Mary, Prince Henry and Prince George, can hardly be misunderstood: "If God and our conscience, that is the voice of God within, have called us to fight manfully, to fight Christianly, and to fight to the end, it would seem out of place to speak of humiliation in this connection. It would be so unreal as to lead to misapprehension among our enemies and among our Indian and other fellow-combatants. It would seem like a crying off from the line which we have adopted in the beginning and have maintained all the way through, it would look like the voice of panic and distrust, or the craven fear with which the savage approaches the idol which he worships."²

With reference to the National Mission of Hope and Repentance of the Church of England, Dr. W. E. Orchard expresses himself as follows: "The Anglican Communion, with a temerity which that body has perhaps never before attained, attempted to organize a great call to Repentance and Hope, and this was set about in an entirely praiseworthy way. The leaders must have known that there were national and certainly ecclesiastical risks in such a movement. If anything like a great religious revival was to sweep the country, it might most seriously interfere with the national prosecution of the war. When religion once gets going it is likely to be a fairly absorbing and unpredictable affair.. But the necessity for assuring the people that there was to be no repentance for the country being at war shut out certain areas from the fire of the Holy Spirit, which

¹ London Times, January 2, 1915.

² quoted in London Times, January 4, 1915.

seems to have had the effect of shutting Him out altogether. God may be rightly invoked for special purposes, but something has gone wrong when it is also stated what He is not wanted for. Even Bishops cannot control the Holy Ghost in this way."¹

The evidence clearly indicates that the war has tended to increase the feeling of national self-righteousness in the different belligerent nations.

(6) The war has tended to destroy faith - in ideals, in man, in God. Many men gave up everything and went out to the front to battle for freedom and justice, with the feeling that this is a righteous war. Months of experience with all of its horrors and brutalities has often shattered these ideals. The men who are in touch with the actual situation at the front know very well that there is nothing righteous about the method of warfare. War is hell. Hell is not righteous.

Countless numbers are coming back suspicious of all ideals. The Sermon on the Mount is looked upon as visionary and incapable of application in daily life. All talk about universal brotherhood and forgiveness of enemies is utter foolishness. "If after this my person says a word about forgiving enemies or any of that sort, I will walk out of the church and never go back." The ideals and glories of war have been swept away by the shocking spectacles seen on every battlefield. Ask the man who has been through this furnace of hell. Former fancies and ideals have vanished with many men.

Along with this loss of faith in ideals is a corresponding loss of faith in man. This is certainly true with regard to the enemy. Nothing is too dastardly for him to stoop to, no crime is too atrocious for him to commit. Generations will pass before Englishmen and Germans have regained confidence in each other. "No German missionary should be allowed for a long period of years to enter British possessions", says Dr. Ogilvie.

¹ In "The Outlook for Religion", p. 18.

of the Church of Scotland.¹ "I have one fear", says the Rev. H. L. Warneford, vicar of Norton Malmesbury, Wilts, "and that is that when the war is over we may get some people into power who, in spite of these wholesale murders on land and sea, in spite of the cries of ruined womanhood, in spite of fiendish cruelties practised upon our prisoners, will for their own ends be willing to grasp the blood-stained hand of Germany and whisper about shaking hands and making friends. If this should be so, I hope our khaki-clad heroes, and the widows and mothers of those who once wore the uniform of honour, will turn the scale and have a voice in the matter of justice being done to our brave dead."²

There is also much loss of faith in one's countrymen. After one has seen his comrades perpetrating all sorts of outrages it is difficult to impose implicit confidence in them again. The outbreak of bestial and ferocious passions which has accompanied this war has done much to destroy confidence in human nature.

For many the incidents in connection with this war has brought about a collapse of faith in God. The concentration of misery and suffering has been too much for multitudes of people. "How can we believe in a good God in the face of the terrible realities of these days?" To call this a holy war only aggravates the feeling of bitterness and rebellion. "If God is in this inferno then He is not holy; if He is holy and has the power, why does He allow it to continue?" If God is good, why does he allow fiendish Zeppelins to murder innocent women and children? These are questions that must be answered, and for many the answers given are not satisfactory. "How can I believe in God?" was the cry that came from the lips of an unfortunate young woman on the streets of London. "They compelled my father and brother to enter the army. Both have been killed in action, leaving me alone on Piccadilly. If there were a God he would not have allowed this to happen. There is no God!" In bitterness of soul, she turned away, leaving the present writer with food for reflection.

¹ Daily Sketch, May 25, 1917 ² London Star, June 19, 1917.

The letters telling of loss of faith in God are not published in the daily newspapers, and it will never be known just how great has been the influence of this war in the destruction of faith in a loving Heavenly Father.

SUMMARY: We do not mean to imply that all men in any nation are affected in the way we have outlined, nor do we contend that the different nations are equally affected. Obviously, this cannot be true with reference to those nations which have had little actual contact with the war or which are only now getting into the struggle. Especially is this true with reference to the United States.

As a citizen of this latter country, the writer has been peculiarly interested in noting some of the effects of the war on Canadians and Englishmen, since they are most like his own people. He has been with British troops during the greater part of his stay in the war zone. Consequently, many of his impressions have to do with them. Lest there be a misunderstanding of any criticism of their conduct in wartime, let him hasten to say that he has an unbounded admiration for the English people. It is only in the most kindly and cordial spirit that these pages are written.

By way of a brief summary, we believe the following to be moral and religious effects arising out of this war:

GOOD EFFECTS

(1) The challenge of war has produced a deeper spirit of unselfishness, generosity, consecration, and self-sacrifice.

(2) Participation in war has created in many a vital, living faith in God, and for others has intensified the reality of the Christian experience.

(3) The war has increased Christian unity and vitality in the churches.

(4) The Allies have held back an autocratic militarism.

EVIL EFFECTS

- ✓ (1) The war has ^{aroused} revived primitive and barbarous passions, and has tended to destroy the sanctity of human life.
- (2) It has increased vice.
- (3) It has made the doctrine of Military Necessity the highest law of conduct, and has tended to dim moral perception.
- (4) It has tended to destroy freedom of belief and action.
- (5) It has ^{increased} ~~increased~~ the feeling of national self-righteousness.
- (6) It has tended to destroy faith - in ideals, in man, in God.

Part Two - THE WAY OF THE CROSS

Thus far we have dealt only with facts - the actual effects of war upon men and nations. It is quite impossible, however, in the face of these facts, to refuse to consider the whole problem of the ethics of war. One could not, in the light of the Christian message which he was trying to present to the soldiers, refrain from asking the question, Is war ever justifiable? The pages that follow set forth the conclusions reached by the present writer, after months of association with soldiers and civilians in several of the belligerent nations, and represent an almost complete change of attitude with regard to the question under consideration.

In this discussion we shall confine ourselves to the ethical and religious phases of the problem. The whole realm of practical politics and specific methods by means of which war shall be abolished, exceedingly important as they are, lie beyond the province of this paper. We shall not attempt to say whether Disarmament or Preparedness is the best means of destroying war, nor shall we discuss the relative merits of a League of Peace and a League to Enforce Peace. We do not underestimate the importance of practical methods, and indeed it is in the interest of effective methods that we stress the value of fundamental principles and attitudes.

Our first task, therefore, is to ascertain whether war is compatible or incompatible with the spirit of Jesus; and second, to analyze carefully the true attitude of individual Christians and the Church toward war. It is to these two problems only that we shall devote ourselves in this discussion.

In seeking to discover the spirit of Jesus, it is our conviction that the literalistic proof-text method furnishes little or no valid proof. We believe that by this means it is impossible clearly to understand the teaching of Jesus. It

is only as we take His teaching as a whole and observe His life in its completeness that we are able to catch His spirit or attitude toward the great problems that face us. Jesus' own life must be the interpretation of His teaching.

I. JESUS AND THE WAY OF THE CROSS

1. The Environment of Jesus.

The teaching and life of Jesus cannot be clearly understood apart from some knowledge of the conditions under which He taught and lived. His attitude toward war cannot be ascertained unless we know something of the political and religious influences of His day. It is to this end the next paragraphs are devoted.

(a) Roman Rule of Palestine.¹ In the time of Jesus, Palestine was a conquered province of the Roman Empire. Jerusalem was the chief defence of a strategic system of fortifications which extended throughout the country. Roman soldiers and mercenaries from Galatia, Germany and Thrace were placed in all fortresses, and foreign ministers and retainers were constantly coming and going from the royal residences.

The Roman authorities were entrusted with full military and judicial powers, and heavy taxes were imposed upon the people. The representatives of Rome also had full power over the Jewish Sanhedrin, and one procurator, Valerius Gratus, changed the High Priest four times within four years. In the year A. D. 19, Tiberius, after drafting four thousand Jews into the Roman Army, banished the entire Jewish colony from the Imperial City.

Every effort was put forth to impart Roman ideals and culture to the Jews. Splendid heathen temples were erected, Roman theaters and amphitheaters were built, military roads were studded with Roman monuments, towns and public edifices received Roman names, chariot races, gladiatorial combats and wild beast fights could be witnessed in the very heart of Judaism.

The Roman governors, tetrarchs and procurators who ruled Palestine during the days of Jesus were cruel and merciless

¹ See W. D. Morrison, "The Jews Under Roman Rule".

tyrants - the murder of the babies of Bethlehem by Herod the Great, the beheading of John the Baptist by Herod Antipas, and the crucifying of the only sinless Man by Pilate, being typical examples of their barbarity and inhumanity.

These are the political conditions under which Jesus lived and labored.

(b) The Messianic Hope. Very much depends upon a clear understanding of the issues involved in the popular conception of the Messianic hope. According to Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels,¹ "Son of David is the most characteristic, as it is the most traditional and historic, designation of the Jewish Messiah. It expressed the most representative type of Messianic expectation. The ordinary uncultured Jew did not trouble himself with apocalyptic dreams of a new heaven and a new earth, and probably there were many cultured Jews who had little taste for the Book of Enoch. These would read with far greater satisfaction the Psalter of Solomon. The chief interest of the Psalter of Solomon for us consists in the strong indications which it gives of the reviving Messianic hopes of Israel at this time under the Roman yoke. Palestine was ready to respond to any bold or able adventurer like Judas, Theudas or Bar Cochba, the last of whom was supported even by the distinguished Rabbi Akiba."²

In this connection, Dean Shailer Mathews says: "The term 'Son of David' had become expressive of the entire Messianic idea as held by all Jews, whether scribes or common people. It indicated that the new Kingdom was to be essentially Jewish, just as its King was to be representative of the most typical royal family of Hebrew history. More than that, it declared the new Kingdom to be essentially military; for to the Jew, David was essentially a man of war, a conqueror of the enemies of Israel. To describe the Messianic King as his son was to ascribe to him the same military prowess."²

¹ Vol. II., p. 176 (See Mt. 9:27, Mk. 10:47,48, Mt. 12:23, 15:22, Mk. 11:10, Mt. 21:9, 15)

² "The Messianic Hope in the New Testament", p. 111.

Dr. Alfred Edersheim says: "To the Nationalist every embodiment, every outward manifestation of what contravened his deepest idea and highest ideal, was absolutely intolerable. What business had the Roman in Palestine; how dared the idolater profane by his presence the sacred soil that was God's; how could he claim to rule the people whose sole King was the Jehovah of the mighty Army and outstretched Hand? Even to ~~admit~~ admit it as a fact, nay to tolerate it, was an act of unfaithfulness to God, of deep unbelief, of apostasy. So patriotism and religion - both in abnormal forms - mingled. They whetted their daggers to the sound of psalms, and sharpened their swords to the martial music of the prophetic utterances, which to them seemed only denunciations and imprecations on the enemy. In one sense every true Jew was a Nationalist, and could not help being such, so long as he was a Jew. Nay, it clung to him with all the instincts of centuries of descent, and hereditary disposition; with all the remembrances of his upbringing and surroundings; and with all the latent enthusiasm of his Eastern and Jewish nature."¹

In like tenor, Dr. Burris A. Jenkins says: "The cry 'The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand!' was as startling to Jerusalem as 'The Revolution is here!' was to Paris in 1793. The Hebrew people were as ready to unsheath swords, pull up paving-stones, and build barricades in behalf of the new Kingdom, as the French were in behalf of liberty, equality and fraternity. It was no new word, this word 'Kingdom of Heaven'. It had long been on the lips of peasant and prophet, herdsmen and statesmen, fishermen and rabbis. It was electric with preparation, dynamic with memories, charged with desperation, longing, hope deferred."²

This was the religious atmosphere in which Jesus lived and presented His message.

¹ In "Prophecy & History in Relation to the Messiah", p. 329-331.

² In "The Man on the Street and Religion", p. 120.

2. The Mission of Jesus.

No one can read the record of the life of Jesus without being impressed with His sense of mission. "I must be about my Father's business" is the keynote of His life. Just what did He conceive the Father's will for Him to be, and what was the underlying purpose of His life? Without attempting an exhaustive consideration of this question, we believe that His mission involved, at least, the following points:

(a) The Revelation of God. The supreme need of man is that he may have a definite, comprehensive and true conception of God. His belief in this connection affects the whole of life. The fanatical dervish mutilates his body; the heathen mother gives her baby to the crocodiles; the faithful Indian widow is burned upon the funeral pyre of her husband; the pious monk withdraws to the desert wilderness; the Psalmist cries out, "O daughter of ^Baylon, that art to be destroyed, Happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou has served us: Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the rock"; the German Emperor (among others) prays for victory over the enemy in battle - all these are based on varying conceptions of God.

In nature, in the great religious leaders and prophets of the world, in our own inner selves, do we find partial witnesses of God. In Jesus Christ, His Son, we have a complete and final revelation. "Many were the forms and fashions in which God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets, but in these days at the end he has spoken to us by a Son." In this discussion we are primarily concerned with the attitude and purpose of God toward His children as revealed by Jesus Christ.

The love of God is no passive affection. In Jesus we see God going out in eager search of His lost children. "For God loved the world so dearly that He gave up His only Son, so that everyone who believes in Him may have eternal life, instead of perishing.) God did not send His Son into the world to

pass sentence on it, but to save the world by Him." "Tell me, if a man has a hundred sheep and one of them strays, will he not leave the ninety-nine sheep on the hills and go in search of the one that has strayed? And if he happens to find it, I tell you he rejoices over it more than over the ninety-nine that never went astray. So it is not the will of your Father in heaven that a single one of these little ones should be lost." "I am the good shepherd; a good shepherd lays down his own life for the sheep."

In the gift of His only Son, we see God drawing nigh in a new way of love and mercy to all men, and through Jesus we gain a new view of the Righteousness, Justice and Holiness of God. We find the former conception recorded in the Law: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."¹ It is this conception that underlies such passages as II. Kings 2:23-24: "And Elisha went up from thence unto Bethel: and as he was going up by the way, there came forth little children out of the city, and mocked him, and said unto him, Go up, thou bald head; go up, thou bald head. And he turned back, and looked on them, and cursed them in the name of the Lord. And there came forth two she-bears out of the wood, and tare forty and two children of them."

Or again, I. Samuel 15:1-11: "And Samuel said unto Saul, Jehovah sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel; now therefore, hearken thou unto the voice of the words of Jehovah. Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, I have marked that which Amalek did to Israel, how he set himself against him in the way, when he came up out of Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass... And Saul smote the Amalekites, from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt. And he

¹ Exodus 21:24,25.

took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep and of the oxen... Then came the word of Jehovah unto Samuel saying, It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king; for ^{he} ~~his~~ is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments... Then said Samuel, Bring ye hither to me Agag the king of the Amalekites. And Agag came unto him cheerfully. And Agag said, surely the bitterness of death is past. And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before Jehovah in Gilgal."

In these passages we find God conceived as the great King and Lawgiver. The prophet of Jehovah must not be held up to scorn, hence the Divine Avenger sends the bears to devour the playful children. The chosen people of Jehovah must not be enslaved or destroyed, and justice demands that the killing of the Israelites be answered by the complete extermination of the Amalekites. Because of his failure to carry out this annihilation of the enemy, the wrath of Jehovah is poured upon Saul, and the prophet Samuel proceeds to hew in pieces the hated king Agag. "An eye for an eye" is the justice of the Law.

We are not holding up to ridicule this conception of God's Justice. It was far higher than the attitude of other peoples of that age. Indeed, this same principle guides the thinking and conduct of the vast majority of the human race even today. When a man commits murder or does some deed of violence, justice demands that his own life be taken as a penalty. Our whole criminal law is based upon this idea of justice.

It is only when contrasted with the revelation of God in Jesus Christ that this idea seems so crude and repulsive. In the mind of Jesus the Righteousness, Justice and Holiness of God find expression in His Redeeming Love. Not in protecting

His laws from violation, nor in taking vengeance upon the wrong-doer, but in changing the heart of the transgressor is His energy expended. The redemption of the sinner - that is, the changing of his attitudes and conduct - is all that the Justice of God demands. For the Christian the former notions of justice and punishment are superseded by Jesus' conception of Love and Redemption. God does not give His children that which they so rich deserve - or else there would be no hope for any of us - but rather He gives us what we need to enable us to follow in His way of life.

It is of fundamental importance to our discussion that we carefully distinguish between the old and new ideas of God. If we accept the theory which runs through much of the Old Testament that God visits divine punishment upon wrong-doers in this world, we are perplexed as to how it could be possible for a few men to plunge a whole world into the horrors of war. As one man said, "I can't understand why God does not strike the Kaiser dead in his tracks." This man held to the former conception of God.

Jesus' idea of God is that He does not send special punishment upon individuals or nations in this world, such as men formerly believed Him to do, but rather the good and the bad are to live side by side until the Day of Separation (see Matthew 13:30). This is not to say that man does not have to pay the penalty for breaking natural or moral laws, for it still remains true that the harvest is after the manner of sowing. Even God's love does not remove the penalty of transgression.

It is true that Jesus' disciples did not quickly grasp the significance of this new conception of God - just as they failed to understand the necessity of Jesus' passion and many other incidents and lessons from His life and teachings - and they wanted to call down fire from heaven on the unbelieving towns. Even after Jesus' death they still saw in a glass darkly and believed that God sent special destructive punishment upon

certain wrong-doers. But from the life and teaching of Jesus Himself we have every reason to believe that God does not in this world destroy the life of the wrong-doer as a special punishment or as a warning to others.

It cannot be repeated too often that the Righteousness, Justice and Love of Jesus Christ is the Holy Love of God. God cannot be less loving and forgiving than is Jesus. ^{He cannot conceive of God doing anything that Jesus would not do.} If Jesus can forgive His enemies while they are crucifying Him, God can and does forgive His erring children, even while they are in their sin. Again we say, His love is so great that He gives Himself to the uttermost in seeking to bring them back into His fold. The old idea in which God is represented as being angry with His children, and in which Jesus because He is more compassionate pleads with the Father for their sake, has no foundation in the Gospels. Nothing is needed to change God's attitude toward men; indeed nothing can change the seeking love of God for His children. God is love - outreaching, redeeming love that never despairs; holy, sacrificial love that is earnestly seeking to give abundant and eternal life to His children.

(b) The Inauguration of the Kingdom of God. The greater part of the teaching of Jesus centers about the Kingdom of God. We have already noted that in the mind of the populace this Kingdom was to be national in its scope; only the chosen people of Israel were to be the recipients of its bounty. But Jesus had an entirely different conception of the Kingdom. It is not to be political in its nature, nor is it to be confined to any group of people or nation; it is to be spiritual in its essence, and is to be open to every person in every land.

"The Kingdom, as Jesus spoke of it, had a double significance. It was something present in Himself, and present, in its germ at least, in the hearts of men opened to God - something to be manifested in a growing and developing form in this world, or in the time then present; but it was also something that should come from God in all its fullness at the 'consummation

of the age', and which should run on into the eternal future. There is no contradiction between these two aspects of the Kingdom: the one is simply the culmination of the other.. In another way, the Kingdom had also a double significance. It was both subjective and objective in its relation to God. It was the reign of God in the hearts of men; yet it was something which came from God Himself, and from God only. Its coming was the Gospel that Jesus preached to the people; it was the drawing nigh of God in His Grace with the Forgiveness of their sins and unto their Salvation. Although with Jesus the Kingdom was not, in its essence, anything outward, but inward and spiritual, it was always something that was to come from God Himself, His drawing nigh in His Grace, the fulfilment of His great promises in the Prophets, the ending of the dark days of bondage and misery, the bringing in of a new era of Redemption and Blessing. Membership in this Kingdom was the same thing as Salvation; it was sonship to God and all that pertained thereto."¹

This is the kind of a Kingdom that Jesus set forth.

(c) The Revelation of the Reality of Sin and the Redemption of Man. Jesus makes no attempt to explain the origin of sin. He simply recognizes it as a terrible fact. It is never pleasant to meditate upon sin, and there is quite a general tendency in our day to tone it down or to pass it off lightly. Not so with Jesus. He draws a clear out distinction between right and wrong. His definition of sin is entirely different from ^{that of} the religious leaders of His time. Sin for Him is not such a trivial thing as breaking the law of the Sabbath or failing to keep the fast days. Sin is the violation of the two great laws of life: "You must love the Lord your God with your whole heart, with your whole soul, and with your whole mind. This is the greatest and chief command. There is a second like it: you must love your neighbor as yourself."²

¹ W. L. Walker, The Cross and the Kingdom, p. 182, 184.
² Matthew 22:37-40 (Moffatt)

Sin is awful to Him because it destroys personal relationships - human and divine. It is no abstraction, nor is it simply missing the mark with reference to the Law, Justice or Honor, as these terms are popularly interpreted. The worst thing about sin is that it separates man from God and if continued in excludes man from His Kingdom. Not only are its effects destructive to man, it gives positive pain to the loving heart of the Father. Man's sin sorely grieves and distresses God. All sin is anti-social, "no man liveth unto himself", and certainly no man's sin is confined to himself. Sin directly harms another or it prevents the sinner from living a life of the greatest usefulness and helpfulness.

In himself man has no power to get free of sin, and the case seems without hope. St. Paul is only voicing a universal feeling when he cries out: "I am a creature of the flesh, in the thralldom of sin. I cannot understand my own actions; I do not act as I want to act; on the contrary, I do what I detest.. I want to do what is right, but the wrong is all I can manage; I cordially agree with God's law, so far as my inner self is concerned, but then I find quite another law in my members which conflicts with the law of my mind and makes me a prisoner to sin's law that resides in my members. Thus, left to myself, I serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin. Miserable wretch that I am! Who will rescue me from this body of death."¹

"If God is to open the Kingdom of Heaven to men, it must be on grounds other than anything as yet in themselves. Left to themselves, their case seems utterly hopeless. God Himself must come to them, to their help and salvation. No mere enforcement of Law, with its spiritual requirements made manifest; no stern call to repentance; no awful picture of the doom of the lost; no preaching of the blessedness of the Kingdom; no representation of the Love of the waiting Father, can effect it: God Himself must come to them in His Grace, and, in spite

¹ Romans 7:14,15, 21-25 (Moffatt)

of their sin and worthiness, be their Saviour."¹

Thus the mission of Jesus involves the revelation of the loving and suffering heart of God, the proclamation and inauguration of the Kingdom of God, the revelation of the reality and hideousness of sin, the assurance of forgiveness, and the gift of power to overcome sin.

3. The Method of Jesus.

(a) Methods He Declined. In this discussion, an extremely important question for us is, Was Jesus ever confronted with a concrete war situation, and was He ever compelled to make a decision as to His own attitude toward the method of war? There is quite a general tendency on the part of Christian leaders today to answer in the negative. Is their conclusion justified, in view of the actual historical facts?

We have already noted that His own country was a province of the Roman Empire and that His countrymen were subjected to all manner of cruelty and tyranny at the hand of the conqueror. Furthermore, the great majority of the Jewish leaders as well as the populace were eagerly looking forward to the promised Messiah who should deliver them from bondage and restore Israel to her former glory. We have also seen that Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah, and that His mission involved the proclamation and inauguration of the Kingdom. By what means should the Kingdom come to pass? In the very nature of the case, Jesus must have spent much time in seeking the solution to this problem. It seems preposterous to believe that Jesus should fail to consider the one means which in the minds of His countrymen seemed adequate to deal with the actual situation; namely, the alternative of war.

We believe that George D. Herron is right when he says: "There are indications that Jesus met, in temptations beyond our power of sympathy to interpret, the question of revolution. Civilization was a Roman dominion, making one vast, splendid, slave-pen of the earth, with suicide the only escape

¹ Rev. W. L. Walker, The Cross and the Kingdom, p. 193.

for fettered, crushed and despairing lives. Roman virtues had been terrible. But when these virtues were dissolving in still more terrible vices, the earth became the arena of unmitigated suffering, seeming like the creation of devils. Could anything prevail against this exhausted system, save the attack of forces of its own kind - forces it could understand?

"Then there was the Jewish Church, which made merchandise of the truth, dealing out past inspirations as religious wares, while it was rejecting the God of the living. How could God get at the world through such misery in society and tyranny in state, through such moral atheism in organized religion, save in the revolution of terrific and destructive forces? The people would accept with universal acclamation and joy the advent and progress of such a deliverance. And history has never dreamed of such a revolutionist as Jesus would have been had he taken the sword."¹

Contrary to the expectations of the Jewish people, the Kingdom is not to come by brilliant victories on the battlefield; nor are the enemies of the Kingdom to be resisted by the sword. Jesus says that we must not only refrain from killing, we must also restrain our anger. He contrasts His Kingdom with that of the Gentiles, who "lord it over them". No man is to be compelled to come into His Kingdom. All of its members must enter of their own free will. According to Jesus, the method of the military conqueror cannot be His way.

To have established a new civilization through the use of forces the world could then have understood would have been the failure of the Kingdom of God. Even if He had been able to overthrow completely the power of Roman militarism and to set up a democratic government of justice and righteousness it would not have ushered in the Kingdom or even have hastened its coming. Not even the added power of the King's throne or the President's chair, the opportunity of governing a nation in righteousness and justice, and leading the people into new ideals

¹ In "Between Caesar and Jesus", p. 258, 259.

as fast as they were ready for them, would have increased the effectiveness of Jesus' work, or else He would have adopted that method.

The question as to whether or not Palestine could have succeeded in throwing off the yoke of Rome was not the determining factor in Jesus' decision. As a matter of historical fact, however, the Maccabees had succeeded under as great difficulties, and that without the aid of "the ten legions of angels" which Jesus had at His disposal. The question as to whether a given method was likely to succeed had no bearing whatever upon the choices of Jesus. He followed ideals and principles of life irrespective of their consequences to Himself and His friends. If the method of warfare could have achieved the purpose for which He lived and died, unquestionably He would have acceded to the wishes of His countrymen and adopted it. He refused it because He saw that even apparent success by means of this method would have defeated the very end He sought to attain.

However, Jesus did not go to the other extreme and adopt an attitude of passive unconcern and docile submission to the wrongs inflicted upon Him and His people. We believe that the man who says that Jesus taught and practiced non-resistance fails to understand His spirit. The world has never seen such a resister as was Jesus. He does not give acquiescence to conditions as He finds them. He opposes evil with all the might and power of His being. His life is a continuous and heroic struggle against evil.

Nor did Jesus adopt the ascetic solution of the problem of sin. He did not join Himself to the Essenes, who were settled in monastic communities near the Dead Sea, and who endeavored to reach absolute religious purity through strict abstemiousness and cleanliness. Jesus did not choose isolation from society as the means of establishing the Kingdom. "I pray not that thou wilt take them out of the world."

Not by means of the sword, nor by passive submission, nor by fleeing to the desert, did Jesus seek to establish the Kingdom.

(b) The Cross. This is the method of Jesus; this death which Cicero describes as "the cruellest, the foulest of punishments". The agony on the cross is the culmination of His way of life: the most startling, revolutionary, dynamic way in all history. It is the paradox of the ages: "a stumbling-block to the Jews, sheer folly to the Gentiles, but ~~we~~ a Christ who is the power of God and the wisdom of God."

Love was His only weapon. He was the living embodiment of His own teaching concerning love - toward God and man. He, who had given the world a heart of infinite love and a life of unbounded service, is basely deserted by His closest friends, denied by His boldest disciple, relentlessly persecuted by the religious leaders, betrayed with a treacherous kiss, dragged from His hour of agony by armed men, unjustly tried, taunted and insulted, spat upon, buffeted and compelled to bear His cross of shame, His quivering flesh nailed to a tree between two criminals; and yet, even when dying in torture, He cries, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they are doing." "Once in the history of the world there was found a man who wholly trusted to the ultimate victory of love. All through His life He refused to use any means which love could not sanctify."

When confronted with the question of human freedom, He went to the bottom of the problem. He saw that unless men's hearts were changed, freedom from Rome would simply mean an exchange of masters. To destroy the oppressors of a nation, is not Jesus' way of bringing freedom to its citizens. "Fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Jesus came to deliver men from bondage, not that occasioned by the military oppressor, but the slavery of their

own sin. "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Real freedom is not a racial, national or international problem: it is personal. Paul, loaded with chains and eating his prison fare, knows no master, save One; Caesar, exercising authority over tens of thousands and dining in royal style, is driven by many passions. Jesus, with His crown of thorns and cup of gall, is free; Pilate, with his diadem of gold and glass of wine, is slave. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed."

The law of love is the very corner-stone of the spirit of Jesus. He sanctions no method save that of love. His whole life is a testimony to His conviction that love never fails. We never find Him inquiring whether it is likely to succeed, or whether under the existing circumstances, in a world not yet ready for Him and His spirit, it is practicable. He goes confidently forward in the spirit of love, regardless of the fact that it is to cost Him and His friends their lives.

Because Jesus' Kingdom is a realm of redeemed children of God, He was compelled to refuse the sword and to follow the way of the cross. They represent two opposing principles of life. The sword produces barbarism, the cross brings tenderness; the sword destroys the sanctity of human life, the cross gives it priceless value; the sword deadens conscience, the cross deepens spiritual perception; the sword causes hatred, the cross compels love; the sword means the attempt to kill your foe, the cross symbolizes the willingness to die in seeking to save your enemy. Thus does the sword differ from the cross.

II. THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE WAY OF THE CROSS

1. The Supremacy of the Cross.

In the cross we see the culmination of the great principle of vicarious sacrifice which enters so deeply into human life. It is the climax of a particular way of and outlook upon life, and is the supreme illustration of a principle that applies to all. "Christ's acceptance of His Cross of unmerited and cruel suffering was an acknowledgement of the Necessity, and of the Justice and Goodness of that Divine order which makes suffering a fact of human experience, and which so often seems harsh and indiscriminating in its operation. He bowed to the Divine necessity for the suffering of the innocent through the sins of the guilty, which is a part of the wider experience of suffering in the world. He did this because He belonged to our Humanity - because He was a member - even the Head - of a race which is a unity. And He thus teaches us how to take the share of suffering that comes to us as members of a race that is truly one - to accept as that which God permits in His all-embracing order of the world to come upon us even though undeserved, and not coming directly from His hand, and to bear it in the spirit of one who seeks to render service to, or to help, his fellows in so accepting and bearing suffering."¹

We believe, with Professor George Adam Smith, that "if we are to get our fellows to believe in the redemptive virtue of Christ's Cross, it will be by proving to them that vicarious suffering and its ethical value are no arbitrary enactments of God, but natural to life, and inevitable wherever sin and holiness, guilt and love, encounter and contend."² In the principle of the Cross is to be found the supreme ideal of all life.

That Jesus Christ claims absolute supremacy cannot be denied. The Kingdom of God is to come through Him. "I am

¹ W. L. Walker, *The Cross and the Kingdom*, p. 253.
² *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, p. 172.

the real and living way: no one comes to the Father except by means of me." "I am the Gate; whoever enters by me will be saved." "I am the bread of life; he who comes to me will never be hungry." "Come unto me, all who are laboring and burdened, and I will refresh you." "I am myself resurrection and life." "I am come that they may have life and have it to the full."

He claims supreme loyalty on the part of His followers. "Follow me" is His summons. He calls men to His way of life. "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and to follow me." "He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; he who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of men; he who will not take his cross and follow after me is not worthy of me. Nothing whatever must be allowed stand between Jesus and his disciples - not even loved ones or nation.

It is quite true that Jesus recognized the sphere of the state, in the statement, "Give Caesar what belongs to Caesar." He paid taxes and never renounced the authority of the state. But this is only a half-truth; He likewise said, "Give God what belongs to God", and "Seek he first the Kingdom of God."

7c St. Paul also upholds the state, especially in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, which is one of the strongholds for those who seek his aid in the justification of war. Upon closer inspection of the teaching of St. Paul, however, the most that can be said in this connection is that the authority of the state is to be recognized and obeyed only in so far as it does not conflict with the higher law of God. What are we to gather from the following words by St. Paul? "Every subject must obey the government-authorities, for no authority exists apart from God; the existing authorities have been constituted by God. Hence anyone who resists authority is opposing the divine order, and the opposition will bring judgment on themselves.. The magistrate is God's servant for your benefit. But if you do wrong, you may well be alarmed; a magistrate does not wield

the power of the sword for nothing, he is God's servant for the infliction of divine vengeance upon evil-doers."¹

Does the man who uses this passage as a justification of war understand St. Paul to mean that all rulers are avengers for God and at all times entitled to the armed support of every citizen? Does this passage mean that the young Turkish Christian in the days of Abdul Hamid would have to regard the Emperor as the minister of God, and do his bidding even to the slaying of the innocent? You say, Certainly not, because the wicked Abdul Hamid was not a Christian emperor. Have we forgotten that the very ruler to whom St. Paul referred was a pagan emperor?

What then does St. Paul mean to teach in this connection? Simply that rulers and laws are necessary and may be instruments of good, and that in so far as they are good, they are to be obeyed. If the command of the ruler is contrary to the law of Christ, our answer must be the same as was St. Paul's to the Roman ~~supremacy~~ commander when ordered to cease witnessing for the Master: "We must obey God rather than man."

None of us believe that rulers are infallible or that their commands should constitute our standard of right and wrong. In itself the method of war is either right or wrong, quite apart from the belief of the ruler, and his command does not determine whether our participation in it is moral or immoral. Therefore, the Christian citizen must come to his decision on a basis of the spirit and teaching of Jesus, quite independently of the command of the ruler. To say that Jesus and St. Paul recognize the function of the State is not to say that they command the Christian to participate in war when ordered to do so by the ruler of the nation.

The same method of interpretation that justifies war on a basis of the passage we have just quoted, also upholds the divine right of kings.

As a matter of fact, is not the real attitude of St. Paul toward the method of war indicated in the verses that

¹ Romans 13:1-4 (Moffatt)

immediately precede the ones we have just quoted? "Never pay back evil for evil to anyone (^{never} ~~not~~ return poison gas for poison gas or air raid for air raid)... No, if your enemy is hungry, feed him (do not starve him by means of submarines, mines or battleship blockades), if he is thirsty, give him to drink; for in this way you will make him feel a burning sense of shame. Do not let evil get the better of you; get the better of evil by doing good."¹ Is it possible so to interpret St. Paul's wonderful chapter on love² as to place him in the group of those who sanction and commend the method of war?

We realize that St. Paul had the individual in mind when he wrote these words. Indeed practically all of the teaching of Jesus and ^{of} the writers of the New Testament ~~xxx~~ is addressed to individuals and not to States. While Jesus worked primarily with the individual, nevertheless His principles and ideals are also applicable to nations. In the very nature of the case this must be so. If the principles of Jesus are not supreme for the state then they break down as the highest law for the individual. There can be no such thing as a dual standard of conduct for the Christian citizen; he cannot follow the law of Christ and at the same time follow a conflicting law of the state. It is not possible for him to cease to be an individual and to become merely a cog in the wheel of state. If it is wrong for an individual to return evil for evil, it is likewise wrong for states to follow this procedure, and the fact that the individual is acting in an official capacity does not make this practice justifiable. If it is wrong to destroy the lives of his fellowmen, the fact that he is wearing the uniform of his country does not make a wrong action to be right. If a given principle is his criterion of right and wrong as an individual Christian, this same principle must of necessity be his standard of conduct as a citizen of the state. He must follow the Christian ideal even if it brings him into conflict with the state.

¹ Romans 12:17-21

² I Corinthians 13.

How can it ever be right for a Christian to surrender himself completely to a military machine which admits that it is not animated by ethical or moral ^{considerations} and which orders him to perform deeds that are directly contrary to the spirit and example of Jesus? How can a man pursue a course of action that is anti-Christian in its very nature, and at the same time follow the way of Jesus?

Many men, while recognising that war is wrong, are justifying participation in this present conflict on the ground that it has been made inevitable by the sins of society, and that under existing conditions there is no other method of preserving human freedom. They admit that if the people of even one nation would practice the principle of love and refuse to kill the enemy, war would be unnecessary. But since it is impossible in this present world of sin to get even a decent proportion of the men of any nation to follow the example of Christ and always return good for evil, war is the only adequate means of resisting. Consequently, it is our Christian duty to do "our bit" in the battle.

What this confession really amounts to, it seems to us, is this: If our neighbors will be guided by the law of love as interpreted by Jesus, we will likewise adopt this standard, but if our neighbors refuse to follow this method, our Christian duty is to enlist with our countrymen and resist the enemy with shot and shell. We confess our inability to find any such doctrine in the teaching or practice of Jesus. He makes no mention of the fact that a man's conduct is to be determined by the attitude or actions of his neighbors. Rather, "Every man shall give an account of himself."

To say that the way of the Cross must be supreme in our lives does not mean that we shall cease to be patriotic or be released from service to the nation. We need a new definition of patriotism and a new scale of values by means of which a man's loyalty and service to his country may be gaged. In the past the military virtues have been allowed to overshadow all others.

One has only to glance through the pages of history or to visit the great cathedrals of the world and note those heroes who occupy the chief places of honor, to have this thought vividly impressed upon him. Daring soldiers and sailors who have rendered conspicuous military or naval service, but whose personal lives were notoriously corrupt and dissolute, are lauded as national heroes and ideals. Even as we write these words, looking across the Seine, we see the gilded tower beneath which are the earthly remains of the great hero of France. The name of Napoleon Bonaparte stands out preeminently in all French history. And yet it would be difficult to find a man whose ideals and methods are further removed from the principle of the Cross of Christ than these of this truly great military genius.

We must recognize that it is only by giving supreme allegiance to the way of the Cross that we become the most loyal citizens of the State. If, as Mazzini says, "no impure man can be a true patriot", it is equally true that no man with wrong ideals and wrong methods can be a true patriot. Who was the truest patriot, Jesus or the zealot? Who had the welfare of his country most at heart, Jesus or the fanatic with dreams of Israel as a world-empire? Who made the greatest contribution to the welfare of the nation, Jesus or the most victorious captain? Every true patriot must have as his goal: "Above all nations is humanity."

When we say that we believe the redeeming love of the cross to be supreme, we do not mean that good does not come from other methods. It cannot be denied that good may, and in fact does, come from evil itself. The crucifixion of Christ was "the worst wrong that history records or that the mind can conceive, the greatest miscarriage of justice, the greatest apparent triumph of evil over good, of might over right, of shame over glory. And if out of this one greatest wrong, out of the shame and pain and defeat, out of this darkness, and desolation and death, God could bring light and life and immortality, then out

*I am angling
near the heart
of the problem
along here.*

of any suffering, out of any evil, out of any death, God can bring ultimate good." In spite of this fact, however, none of us are quite willing to admit that the nailing of Jesus to the cross was a praiseworthy deed.

Undoubtedly, great and lasting good has resulted from many wars in the past. We Americans point with pride to the results of our War of Independence and Civil War. No loyal American can fail to glory in the spirit of Washington and Lincoln. Surely the freedom of the Colonies and the emancipation of the slaves were notable achievements. But are we not blind to the facts when we say that this freedom could only be accomplished by means of warfare and bloodshed? Has not slavery been abolished in England? Does not the citizen of Canada or Australia possess equal freedom with the native-born American? How did England free her slaves, and by what means did Canada and Australia achieve their liberty? We glory in the spirit of Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Lee and Jackson alike, but we cannot believe that the method of war is ever justifiable or the best way out.

As we have already noted, good results certainly have come and will continue to come from the present war. We stand awed and humbled in the presence of the courage, devotion and sacrifice of men, women and children alike in all of the nations now at war. Nothing could be further from our wish than to reflect in any way upon the spirit of countless thousands and even millions of men and women who have given their very all for country. There has been a magnificent response in every one of the warring nations. That many millions of men and women of varied races should so forget self as gladly to give their lives in the effort to save others should give us real joy and lasting satisfaction. Surely we shall not say that all of this is in vain.

Our belief that war is contrary to the way of the cross is not based on any theory of the use of force. We are

in hearty agreement with Professor Hogg when he says that the use of force in itself is neither moral nor immoral. We also agree with Dr. Thomas, in his thought-provoking little book, "The Immorality of Non-Resistance", that absolute non-resistance to evil is immoral. We believe that Jesus taught resistance to evil as the great duty of His followers. His whole life was a grand protest against evil wherever he found it. As we interpret His teaching by His life, we do not believe that He necessarily condemns the use of all physical force in the bringing about of moral ends.

But there is a vast difference between admitting this and saying that Jesus sanctions or commends the method of warfare. There may be much truth in the old adage, "Spare the rod, and spoil the child", and sometimes the teacher, prompted by his very love for the pupil, may administer physical punishment with beneficial results. But if the teacher should carry the use of force to the extent of taking the life of the boy, should we say that this use of force is a manifestation of love? There are instances where the use of physical force may be the means of preventing a crime and instrumental in redeeming the criminal. But if by the use of force we destroy the life of the criminal, do we not automatically sever our last opportunity of rendering him any service? It may be that "there are times when the best way to show our love for a man is by fighting him", but is there ever an occasion when we can redeem a man by killing him?

We believe the State is justified in restraining the criminal and in separating him temporarily from society, for the purpose of redeeming him. But we cannot reconcile the guillotine, the scaffold, the electric chair or the sword with the redeeming love of the cross.

The use of force in war is immoral, we believe, because its purpose is destruction, not redemption. When we speak of the redemption of war, we mean the redemption of our own lives, our loved ones, our countrymen, "humanity" or "the world" -

never the redemption of the enemy lying dead in the trenches.
The use of force is moral or immoral in proportion to its
redeeming power upon the person against whom it is directed.

It is sometimes said that Jesus would not go to war because of His profession: as a prophet of righteousness, He had a different mission to fulfill. We are not aware that Jesus ever said anything about a different standard of right and wrong for members of various professions. Nor do we anywhere find Him saying that He is guided by different principles from those that are to be followed by His disciples. If He is our full and complete ideal and example, then that which was right for Him, during His earthly career, cannot be wrong for us, and that which was wrong for Him cannot be right for us, as His followers. To say that there are different standards of morality for different professions is to destroy true righteousness. Participation in war is right for us in so far as it is right for Jesus, and it is wrong for us in so far as it is wrong for Him.

Can there be any doubt in the minds of those of us who regard Jesus as the Divine Son of God, and who believe that He laid down His life seeking to give abundant life to all men, as to the relative merits of His and other methods of salvation? Could He be our highest ideal if He did not use the best of methods in seeking to save us? However much of good there may be in other methods, can we doubt that His was the very best of all? If there was a best method for Jesus, is not that same method best for His disciples? If He applied the principle of love at all times and under all circumstances, should we not do likewise? If war for the liberty of God's chosen people and a world ruled in righteousness by Jesus Himself was a thing to be rejected, what shall we say of an American or European war?

The Kingdom of God is supreme in its claim upon the Christian, and the call is for men to follow the way of Jesus with utter abandon - men who will enter with Him into the

great adventure of life, risking all on the redeeming power of the cross.

"This is my commandment to you, to love one another as I have loved you. No one has greater love than this - a man laying down his life for his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you.. This I command you to love one another. If the world hates you remember that it has first had me as the fixed object of its hatred.. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you." "But I command you all, love your enemies, and pray for your persecutors; that so you may become true sons of your Father in Heaven."

2. The Practicability of the Way of the Cross.

Since August 1914 there has been a tremendous increase of the feeling that Christianity is not practicable for this world. It may have a message concerning the New Jerusalem, but it cannot solve the problems of Berlin, London or Washington. It may be all right for women and children, and even old men who live in the secluded spots of the earth, but it has no place in the busy thoroughfares, market places or tribunals of mankind. During these months there has been an avalanche of articles and books on "the failure of Christianity."

For a number of years prior to 1914 there was an increasing feeling that the method of war was a barbarous and inhuman method of settling international differences, and some even went so far as to prophecy that war was a relic of the past: science, commerce, international law, socialism, and Christian ethics had sealed its doom and into the scrap heap it must go. Then - as a bolt out of a clear sky - came those fatal days. Belgium was invaded. In the face of that situation, Christian ^{methods} ~~principles~~ faded into the background. England declared war: what else could she do? She did not

want to fight, but honor compelled her to stand by brave little Belgium. We are told that the method of Christian love was utterly inadequate to meet this situation. As one eminent Christian leaders says: "To offer the esoteric Christian ethic for public use when national passion is rising or loose is to stroke a crocodile or tickle a tiger. The right and fit thing to do then is to fall back on an inferior ethic and ~~xxxxx~~ make the best of it."¹

Let us not drift into the believe that Jesus dealt abstractly with human problems. He was face to face with a concrete situation not unlike in principle to that of Belgium in 1914. Germany invaded Belgium: Roman overran Palestine; Germany imposed heavy taxes on the Belgians: Rome did the same with the Jews; Germany shelled the great cathedral: Rome defiled and then destroyed the holy temple; the Germans murdered innocent Belgians: in this they were only following the example of Herod and Pilate. Was the gospel of redemptive love deemed inadequate to meet the situation in 1914? Let us not forget that the contemporaries of Jesus looked upon this same gospel as utter folly. Yet He steadfastly followed this way and taught His disciples that they must come after Him.

We hear it said that the Christian in England in 1914 was placed in a ~~sticker~~ dilemma and was compelled to choose between two evils. War is wrong, but it was the lesser evil. If this is true, then Jesus was in a similar predicament and was compelled to do wrong - whether He chose the lesser or greater evil. How could He do wrong and still be absolutely sinless? No, we cannot believe that Jesus ever did a wrong deed, nor do we admit that participation in wrong doing is ever necessary for His followers. With Dr. Campbell Morgan, we believe: "Jesus forever put an end to that iniquitous combination of words found on the lips of some people: necessary evil."

¹ P. T. Forsyth, in "The Christian Ethic of War" p. 22.

Granted that the present war is a struggle of ideals, militaristic imperialism against peaceful democracy, is it possible for the battlefield to determine which shall survive in the world? Nineteen centuries ago there was a similar conflict of ideals, the imperialism of Rome against the democracy of Jesus. Rome won, Jesus was crucified, Jerusalem was razed to the ground, the disciples were scattered and persecuted. But even victory for imperialism was defeat, and defeat for democracy was victory. Imperial Rome has long since fallen into decay, but succeeding centuries have seen the democracy of Jesus more triumphant. The fiercer the persecution, the more vigorous has been the growth of Christian ideals. It is preposterous to talk of militarism crushing democracy by victories on the battlefield. Great ideals simply cannot be destroyed in this fashion. Neither militarism nor democracy can be permanently destroyed by force of arms. Even after weary months of unsurpassed fury of combat, and after millions of lives have been slain, no single moral issue will have been settled by this war.

Undoubtedly, the Christian is confronted with situations from which there is no escape save at the cost of great suffering and perhaps the loss of life. In this respect he is only following in the steps of his Master. Jesus frankly warned His disciples of the dangers that would come because of their following His teaching and example. Is it too much to say that Jesus knew something of the persecution that would come upon those who following His method? Did He have any idea that Stephen would be stoned to death, and that the persecutor Saul would himself become the apostle of love, bearing in his own body the marks of his service? When He spoke of sending them forth as lambs among wolves, did He have a presentiment that some of them, because of having followed His method, would meet violent death in the arena with the lion and tiger, as the jewel-bedecked royalty of Rome looked mercilessly on? Was it altogether

beyond His conception to think of the cruel persecution by Emperor Nero of innocent women and children, whose only crime was that they followed His method of love? Yes, Jesus knew that His followers would suffer persecution and death because of their allegiance to Him and His spirit of love. He told them that the day would come when men would think they were serving God by killing them. Is it not true that at least one brother and many of His disciples and followers actually did meet death because of their loyalty to His method?

If in 1914 the Christian people of the various nations had refused to compromise, if they had shown the same spirit of loyalty, sacrifice and utter disregard of consequences which has been displayed by the soldiers in this conflict, if they had staked everything upon the redeeming power of sacrificial and unconquerable love - yes, if they had followed the way of the cross, it would have meant the martyrdom of many; but, we believe, it would have long ago brought this war to an end and would have proved to be the most powerful factor in the healing of the nations.

It is all very well to say that the doctrine of resistance by the sole means of love is only possible in the millenium or in some Utopian dream. But what we would like to know is this: Did Jesus intend that His teaching should be applied only when the Kingdom had fully come to pass, or did He intend it to be the means of bringing in the Kingdom? We cannot believe that He intended it as a guide for conduct only in the distant future. If He gave it as a present standard, then, if we are true to Him, we must take His principle of redeeming love as our only guide even in this hour of world crisis, regardless of what any other man does. Right and wrong are not determined by majorities, and the conduct of our neighbor is not our criterion of truth and righteousness. "When He called upon men to follow Him, to share His baptism and drink His cup, He was not mocking them with impossible ideals. He was asking

them to be as He was, to live for the same ends, to undertake the same task. Jesus invited men to His ethical and spiritual level. The blunting of this call by the declaration that Jesus can never be followed by mortal men is responsible for the low state of Christian discipleship."¹

We believe that the ~~spirit and~~ method of Jesus is applicable to any situation with which we may be confronted. Its practicability ~~was demonstrated~~ was demonstrated by its redeeming effect upon those very people who cried out, "Crucify Him! Crucify Him!" Listen to their later agonizing and penitent cry, "What shall we do?" From that day many of them began to travel the way of Jesus. All down through the years the preaching and living of the Gospel of the forgiving and redeeming love of the cross has convinced men of sin - their sin - and has led them to a sense of freedom from sin.

In the eyes of the world the way of the cross has always seemed impracticable. Let us try to realize "the utterly inconceivable absurdity of this bunch of Galilean fishermen - and fools and rascals and maniacs - setting out to capture the world. One of them wrote an Apocalypse. He was in a penal settlement on Patmos, when he wrote it. The sect was in a fair way of being stamped out in blood, as a matter of fact; but this dreamer saw a triumphant Church of ten thousand times ten thousand - and thousands of thousands - there were hardly as many people in the world at that time; the great Rome had fallen and the 'Lamb' ruled. Imagine the amusement of a Roman pagan of 100 A. D. who read the absurd book. Yet the dream has come true; that Church has triumphed. Where is the old religion? Christ has conquered, and all the gods have gone, utterly gone - they are memories now, and nothing more."²

The success of Christian missions is founded on the way of the cross. Those brave men and women have faced unknown

¹ W. E. Orchard, "The Necessity of Christ", p. 86.

² T. R. Glover, "The Jesus of History", p. 199, 200.

dangers from hostile savages, with no weapon save the story - exemplified in their own lives - of the redeeming power of the cross. Many of them have been killed, but the gift of their lives has been the most effective means of transforming the hearts of their slayers. The fact that so many hundred Christians, native and foreign, followed the way of the cross during the great Boxer uprising is the most powerful apologetic for Christianity in China.

In the face of the actual historical fact that the great^{est} progress of the human race has come by way of the cross, shall we still maintain that it is not practicable to solve the problems of our day? Rather, it is truer to say that the way of the cross is the only really redemptive way of life. With E. A. Burroughs, we believe: "The nature of the universe being what it is, the thorough-going idealist is also the most thoroughly practical man. We have scorned idealism, and we have failed to be practical."¹ In the light of the destruction, agony, bereavement and sorrow of these months, can it be denied that the method of warfare is the very essence of impracticability?

"We look

But at the surface of things; we hear
Of towns in flames, fields ravaged, young and old
Driven out in troops to want and nakedness;
Then grasp our swords and rush upon a cure
That flatters us, because it asks not thought:
The deeper malady is better hid;
The world is poisoned at the heart."

Jesus is the world's great idealist, and His principle of redeeming love is the great ideal of all ages. The way of the sword is utterly impracticable; the way of the cross is supremely practicable.

¹ In "The Valley of Decision".

What does
you have written
justifies this
sentence?

III. THE CHURCH AND THE WAY OF THE CROSS

1. Mistakes of the Church.

As related to the question of war, throughout the centuries the position of the Church has been an unenviable one, and the actual historical facts constitute a pathetic and tragic record. We cannot believe that the great historian Lecky is altogether wrong in the following observation: "In looking back with our present experience, we are driven to the melancholy conclusion that, instead of diminishing the number of wars, ecclesiastical influence has actually, and very seriously increased it. We may look in vain for any period since Constantine in which the clergy as a body exerted themselves to repress the military spirit, or to prevent or abridge a particular war with an energy at all comparable to that which they displayed in stimulating the fanaticism of the crusades, in producing the atrocious massacres of the Albigenses, in embittering the religious contests that followed the Reformation."¹

Again and again the churches in the various nations have adopted the method of war to advance their own ends and have thrown themselves with fervor and fury into long and bitter struggles. In our generation the Church does not feel justified in using the method of war to promote spiritual ends and does not assume a position of leadership in bringing about war, as once was the case. Nevertheless, the Church is so conservative and slow to change that it still sanctions war under the direction of the state and permits its members to participate in such a conflict. Indeed we may go further and say that the Church not only sanctions war but enthusiastically supports it.

One has only to turn to one of the great church creeds to see how true this is. In the thirty-nine Articles of

¹ "History of European Morals", vol. 2. p. 269.

the Church of England, it is laid down that it is the duty of the Christian, at the command of the magistrate, to engage in war. While other branches of the Church may not have this idea incorporated in their creeds, it cannot be denied that with few exceptions they agree with the general principle enunciated.

Having no positive convictions that the method of war is always anti-Christian and should never be adopted by followers of Jesus, the Church in every nation has found it easy to persuade itself that the cause of its country is a righteous one and should be supported to the very limit. As a rule church leaders are not experts in international law and are content to abide by the decision of diplomatists and cabinets of war. Then too the great mass of church members never have access to the full facts. If the leaders of a nation feel that they ought to go to war, the bureau of censors gives out those facts that tend to increase the war feeling and holds back information that might produce a lack of confidence in the justice of the nation's cause. With feeling running high and the censors giving out one-sided and misleading reports it is not difficult to convince people that freedom and democracy or even the progress of the Kingdom of God depends upon the vigorous prosecution of the war to a successful termination. As long as the Church makes its decision as to the righteousness of the cause of a nation on the impulse of the moment, at a time of national crisis ^{and} when inflamed by passion and prejudice, just so long will it continue to justify war.

If the governments of Germany, England, France, Russia and the other lands had known that the Christian people in the respective countries would refuse absolutely to participate in war, we do not believe the nations would now be engaged in deadly combat. Because the Church had not gone on

record as being utterly opposed to the method of all war, the various branches have now come to think and act in accordance with the ideas of the war cabinets in the different countries.

"On the eve of the greatest European war", says the Rev. F. A. Simpson, "organized Christianity lifted hardly a little finger to avert it. On the outbreak of it, it was at once ready to assure every country concerned ~~in it~~ that its participation in it was right. War in general may be wrong, perhaps; but this particular war, so long as it lasts, is always right and always equally so for both sides. That has been the general contribution of the vast majority of Christian teachers and preachers in all wars between Christian peoples; an admirably impartial alacrity to bless the banners of both sides. Hearers of the Word would do well to remember what preachers of it sometimes forget, that at that very moment, with no whit less fervour and sincerity, other Christian preachers of equal eminence, accounted by their congregations equally well-informed, are engaged in proving to the champions of the opposite side the peculiarly Christlike character of their cause, with the assurance of God's especial favor towards them."¹

Even if it could be positively proved that one nation was altogether in the wrong and the other entirely in the right; if the aims and ambitions of one nation were barbarous and tyrannical, while the motives and ideals of the other were unselfish and sacrificial, even under these conditions Christian people would not be justified in adopting a method that is absolutely anti-Christian. In spite of much current opinion to the contrary, the end does not justify the means. The method of war is anti-Christian in its very nature, and the Church of Jesus Christ should refuse to sanction or participate in any war, however righteous may be the cause and however high may be the ideals of the nation. *You cannot cast out Satan by Satan's weapons.*
in "War and Christianity", p. 37.

The churches have forsaken the way of their Master and have followed the way of the world. They have confessed that the way of the cross is not always practicable and that sometimes it is necessary for the Church to follow a course that is directly anti-Christian.

In spite of this fact, it is our conviction that the vast majority of Christians who are participating in this war are dominated by very high ideals and motives. They have ceased to live for selfish ends, they have taken up arms to overthrow a barbarous militarism, they are fighting for freedom and democracy, they are suffering and sacrificing for the weak and oppressed, they are dying for the Kingdom of God. The motives, desires and aspirations of these Christian soldiers are worthy of the highest commendation. Indeed, in many cases their spirit is far more praiseworthy than that manifested by some who are prone to criticize their participation in war. We stand in humility and reverence in the presence of the devotion and sacrifice being shown by the great host of Christian men in the various armies today.

For their motives we have only words of praise. With their method we emphatically disagree. That it is possible to combine a noble and praiseworthy spirit with an anti-Christian method is clearly shown by historical facts. Attitudes and deeds that are now outlawed and repudiated even by the ungodly, were once fathered by the Christian leaders and championed by the Church. This is not confined to any particular country or even to a special period of time. It has been true throughout the centuries.

As an attempt to emphasize the truth of this point, let us turn for a moment to certain specific acts, long since outlawed by civilized nations, which were once justified and defended by the Church. For many centuries the Church sanctioned the duel as a righteous method of settling private quarrels. "The duel was in fact an appeal from human justice

to the God of battles, partly a sanction of the current creed that might is right, that the brave not only will win, but deserve to win. It was on these grounds that Gundobald justified the famous edict passed at Lyons, which establishes the wager of battle as a recognized form of trial. It is God, he argued, who directs the issues of national wars, and in private quarrels we may trust His providence to favor the juster cause."¹

For how many decades and even centuries did the Church defend the iniquitous practice of human slavery? In the year 1788 in the city of Liverpool, one R. Harris, published a book, of 78 pages, entitled: "Scriptural Researches on the Licitness of the Slave-Trade, Shewing its Conformity with the Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, Delineated in the Sacred Writings of the Word of God." He begins this noble work as follows: "I hasten to inform the reader, who has cast an eye on the Title Page, that in attempting to establish the licitness of the Slave-Trade, nothing is farther removed from my thought than to set up as an advocate for injustice and oppression: I am as much at enmity with both as the most sanguine advocate for African liberty may be. Whatever is essentially incompatible with the sacred and inalienable rights of justice and humanity, can claim no place in the catalogue of virtues, even of the lowest rank; it must be forever branded with every mark of infamy and guilt. Far then from attempting the least encroachment on the rights of virtue, my sole trust in the present Tract is to examine with the utmost impartiality the intrinsic nature; that is whether the trade itself, prescinding from every other incidental circumstance, which may have rendered the practice of it hateful, or even criminal, be in its own nature licit or illicit."

~~Continuing on page~~ After a full and complete discussion of the various passages in the Bible, he concludes: ~~With~~ "The several passages quoted in the series of the foregoing Researches have positively declared that the Slave-Trade is intrinsically good and licit, and this by a necessary

¹ Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edit., vol. 8, p. 641.

consequence, must be essentially so in its own nature, however contrary such declaration may be to the received opinion of some men for any length of time." This good man Harris did not stand alone in his day; in fact, he was one of a great majority.

By whose sanction were thousands of "witches" burned at the stake? Cotton Mather, D. D. from Glasgow, a Fellow of the Royal Society, a brilliant clergyman and one of the most influential men in the American Colonies during the latter part of the 17th century, is one of the men who stand out in this terrible persecution of innocent women and children. Hear what his biographer has to say: "Cotton Mather had on the whole a noble character. He believe strongly in the power of prayer; his spiritual nature was high strung and delicate. He was remarkable for his godliness, his enthusiasm for knowledge and his prodigious memory. He published more than four hundred works."¹ Keep in mind, he was a deeply spiritual man, and his persecution was done in the name of Christianity.

The Protestant Church is inclined to cast reproach upon the Roman Catholic Church for the unspeakable terrors of the Inquisition, by means of which heretics were tortured into orthodoxy. But let those of us who are wont to throw stones, be sure that our own dwellings are not made of glass. Have we forgotten that in Protestant England, as late as in 1670, physical force, even to the extent of killing, was used in changing men's religious convictions?² In 1687 - less than two hundred and fifty years ago - an eighteen year old boy named Hikenhead was accused of heresy and hanged in Edinburgh.² This was done in the name of Christianity, and defended by the Church as the lesser of two evils.

From the viewpoint of practically all Christian leaders today, the method of the Inquisition is the direct

¹ Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edit. vol. 17, p. 884.
² " " " " " 14, p. 595.

antithesis of the way of the cross. And yet no true student of history can deny that in many cases the motives of the persecutors were entirely praiseworthy. Their one desire was to serve the Kingdom of God.

"The fiery Jerome argued that piety and zeal for God could not be cruelty; rigor, in fact, is the most genuine mercy since temporary punishment may avert eternal perdition.. St. Bernard assumes the duty of the secular power to avenge the wrong done to God by heresy, and, bling to the danger of man's assuming himself to be minister of the wrath of God, he quotes St. Paul, 'For he beareth not the sword in vain; for he is the minister of God, and revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil'. St. Thomas Aquinas lays down the rules with merciless precision. Heretics, he tells us, are not to be tolerated. The tenderness of the Church allows them to have two warnings, after which, if pertinacious, they are to be abandoned to the secular power, to be removed from the world by death."¹

"There is not doubt that the people were as eager as their pastors to send the heretic to the stake. Men of the kindest tempers, the profoundest intelligence, the noblest aspirations, the purest zeal for righteousness, professing a religion founded on love and charity, were ruthless when heresy was concerned, and were ready to trample it out at any cost of suffering. Dominic and Francis, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, Innocent III. and St. Louis, were types in their several ways of which humanity in any age might well feel proud, and yet they are as unsparing of the heretic as Eszelin do Romano was of his enemies. With such men it was not hope of gain or lust of blood or pride of opinion or wanton exercise of power, but sense of duty, and they but represented what was universal public opinion from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century."²

¹ Henry Charles Lea, "History of the Inquisition", vol. 1, p. 214, 219, 229.

² *ibid.* p. 234.

"As heresies increased and grew more threatening and milder means seemed only to aggravate the evil, the minds of earnest and enlightened men, brooding over it, and contemplating the awful possibilities of the future, when the Church of God might be overthrown by the conventicles of Satan, grew inflamed, and fanaticism inevitably followed. When this point was reached, when people and pastor alike felt that the Church Militant must strike without pity if it would prevail against the legions of hell, no firm believer in the doctrine of exclusive salvation could doubt that the truest mercy lay in sweeping away the emissaries of Satan with fire and sword. God had wonderfully raised the Church to fight His battle. It was responsible not only in the present, but also for the souls of the faithful yet unborn through countless generations, and if weakly untrue to its trust, it could not plead inability to extenuation. In view of the awful possibilities of neglected duty, what were the sufferings of a few thousand hardened wretches who, deaf to the solicitations of repentance, were hurried, but a few years before their time, to their master the Devil? The Church knew from Holy Writ that Jehovah was a God delighting in the extermination of his enemies. They read how Saul, the chosen King of Israel, had been divinely punished for sparing Amalek, and how the prophet Samuel had hewn him to pieces; how the wholesale slaughter of unbelieving Canaanites had been ruthlessly commanded and enforced; how Elijah had been commended for slaying four hundred and fifty priests of Baal; and they could not conceive how mercy to those who rejected the true faith could be sought but disobedience to God."¹

"How, moreover, cruelty to the heretic could be conjoined with boundless love and goodwill to men, is well exemplified in the career of the Dominican, Fra Giovanni Schio da Vicenza. Profoundly moved by the condition of northern Italy, filled with dissensions which raged, not only between city and city, burgher and noble, but which divided families,

ibid, p. 237, 238.

he devoted himself to the mission of an Apostle of Peace. In 1233 his eloquence at Bologna induced the opposing parties to lay aside their arms, and led enemies to swear mutual forgiveness in a delirium of joyful reconciliation. So great was the enthusiasm which he excited that the magistrates submitted to him the statutes of the city and allowed him to revise them at discretion. On the plain of Paguara, near Verona, he called a great assembly of Lombard peoples, and that innumerable multitude, swayed by his fervour as by a voice from heaven, proclaimed a general pacification. Yet this man, so worthy a disciple of the Great Teacher of Divine love, when installed in Verona, proceeded to burn in the public square sixty men and women of the principal families of the town, whom he had condemned as heretics."¹

Can it be denied that there is a striking similarity in the spirit shown by these men and that which dominates many Christian leaders today? On every hand we hear that righteousness and justice demand severe measures. St. Paul is quoted to show that the state is the instrument of God for the punishment of evil-doers, and we are confidently assured that our own nation, aided by our glorious Allies, has been especially chosen of God for the unpleasant task of destroying the power of the evil enemy. Our motives in this war are not "gain or lust of blood or pride of opinion or wanton exercise of power, but sense of duty". The freedom of the world is at stake and the very progress of the Kingdom in coming generations depends upon our crushing out the false and evil philosophies of life that control the enemy. The God of David is a god of battles, and surely He has raised up our nation for such a time as this. With boundless love in our hearts we can take advantage of the gentle breeze and waft the poison gas over the trench of the enemy, and with infinite compassion we can, in return for air raids on London and Paris, drop bombs on helpless women and children in Constantinople and Freiburg. As compared with

¹ ibid, p. 240.

the issues at stake, the lives of a few millions of the enemy are of no consequence whatever. Righteousness, justice and love all demand that this war continue until militarism and autocracy are destroyed.

We are speaking in all seriousness when we say that we believe the motives of the vast majority of Christians who are participating in the present war are above reproach - and not only so, they deserve the hearty commendation of all men. We have no word of condemnation for their motives. Nor can we believe that we are justified in censuring the motives of such Christian leaders as St. Thomas Aquinas, Dominic, Francis, Vicenza or Cotton Mather. Their motives are to be praised, but their method is almost universally condemned by present day Christians. We rejoice in the high motives of those Christians who are participating in this war, but we are convinced that their method is utterly wrong. Neither the sword nor the stake follow the way of the cross.

Let us hasten to say that our purpose in bringing up these unpleasant memories is not to cast reproach upon the Church. Our only object is freely to recognize that in other days it has in all good conscience countenanced and even supported unspeakable wrongs. Do not understand us to say that merely because the Church has used wrong methods in the past necessarily implies that her present methods are wrong. Such is not our contention. We simply raise the question, Is there not enough of a parallel between the arguments advanced in justification of the present war and those used by equally devout Christian leaders in defence of the ~~existing~~ practices we have mentioned, to cause us to stop for a moment and ponder these questions?

With us, and with more people than we realize, it carries little weight to say that the Church is against war, when in no nation nor at any time within a thousand years has the Church as a body stood squarely against war. The Church is

against war in general, but in full sympathy with this war in particular. What the Church in each country is saying is that she is against war on the part of the enemy, but highly in favor of the war of her own nation. With the Church not taking a decided stand against war, what could we expect other than this world catastrophe? If the Church of Jesus Christ is not against war, surely we cannot expect those on the outside to prevent war.

What would this mean in the present instance? on part of outside?

If the Church is against war, why in the name of all that is holy, does she not say so in unmistakable terms, and then stand by her declaration at all costs? As long as the Church continues to justify each particular war, just so long will wars continue to exist. Does it require the gift of prophecy to say that future generations will look upon the present justification of war by the Church in much the same way that we look upon the defence of slavery or the sanction of torture to change religious convictions (by the Church?)

We do not wish to leave the impression that we are opposed to the Church. Far from it. It is only because we believe that the Christian Church has the only solution of the world's problems that we are so concerned. We have dwelt at such length upon what we believe to be the weaknesses and inconsistencies of the Church because it is only as we clearly recognize our past mistakes and present faults that we can hope to make the greatest progress in the future. It is because the Church is our only hope that we grieve so at the weakness of her message in this hour of world crisis and need.

8. A Positive Message.

Any effective message by the Church against war must be founded upon true penitence. We must frankly recognize that the past attitude of the Church toward torture, witchcraft, slavery, duelling and war has been contrary to the way of the cross. Let us admit that the Church has for centuries relied upon the method of war to insure protection and justice, and that other methods have not been seriously considered. It has been taken for granted that battleships and big guns ^{are} were the only weapons capable of bringing about justice and righteousness between nations. In adopting and following this attitude and method the Church has sinned grievously.

Only by confessing her sins in this regard, and by deep and lasting penitence, can the Church disarm the just criticism that is being heaped upon her for participating in this terrible war - this colossal blunder against the Kingdom of God, and absolutely denial of the way of the cross. Only by confessing that her share in this and other wars has been contrary to the spirit of Jesus, can she preach with the greatest power the Sermon on the Mount and the principle of Calvary. When the Church is truly penitent then will she receive power to overcome war.

Based upon the conviction that her past justification of war has been sinful, we believe that the message of the Church against war should embrace, at least, these points:

(a) Refuse to Sanction any Method that Violates the Way of the Cross. This is of primary importance. Because the Church has not acted upon the conviction that all war is contrary to the spirit of Jesus, she has under the pressure of the moment furnished a reason for and justified the waging of practically every war for a thousand years - that is, the Church in each nation has justified the part of that particular nation. This will always be so until the Church takes a stand squarely against all war. Only by taking this action can the Church

keep her balance in the time of national excitement and crisis.

The Church must not count the cost and then make her decision on a basis of probable results. It must adopt Jesus' standard of success and failure and follow His way of life, wherever it ^{may} lead and whatever it may cost. The Church must not be dismayed by the challenge of the world, "Show us a sign! Show us one community or state that has ever successfully governed itself by the sole means of love and the sacrificial principle of Calvary!" The task of the Church is not to show signs, but to permeate society with the spirit of the cross, to follow the way of the Master even though the path leads to seeming defeat, and to have faith to believe that no life which follows in His steps can end in failure.

This stand will involve considerable danger, both to the Church and to the nation. But it must be followed if the Church is to make ^{its} ~~the~~ maximum contribution toward the abolition of war and the progress of the Kingdom of God. Whatever practical methods ^{it} ~~the~~ may advocate or sanction, if ^{it} ~~the~~ is true to the Master, it cannot be a party to any method that involves a violation of His spirit. If all war is contrary to the way of the cross, then it should never be sanctioned by the Church.

(b) Adopt and Follow an Active, Heroic, and Sacrificial Principle of Redeeming Love. The refusal to sanction any war does not mean that the Church is to remain passive in the presence of wrong. It must actively and continuously resist all forms of injustice and abuse of power. Political and industrial oppression alike must be overcome, and the same method must be used for the overthrow of both. We are no more justified in using the method of war to obtain political liberty than to achieve industrial freedom. Indeed, the latter is the more galling bondage.

In the face of the gigantic evils that confront us today, no policy of careless indifference or passive unconcern will prove effective. Nor will it suffice to adhere to the

conventional, or to the doctrine of the status quo. We need not expect the wrongs of the world to right themselves while we sit idly by. Some method that is startling, explosive, revolutionary is demanded at a time like this.

All this is to be found in the way of the cross. As exemplified in the life of Jesus Christ, it is the most dynamic, riotous, tumultuous way of all life. It is the method that was chosen by the world's Redeemer, and it is the most powerful and irrefragable manner of living known to history. More than once it has turned the world upside down, and it can do it in our day if only the Church will faithfully follow the way of its Lord. His way leads to truth, to life and to the Father.

We have seen that His purpose was the redemption of the wrong-doer, and His sole means of resistance to evil is the vigorous, aggressive, enthusiastic preaching and living the law of love. His method of overcoming every wrong is by returning goodness for evil. If the Church is true to the principle of ^{its} the Master, ~~her~~ attitude toward political and industrial oppression must be that of open, fearless, active resistance. On this point there should be no controversy. As to the method to be used, shall it attempt to cure one evil by the use of another? Shall it give an inoculation of poison to prevent the dreaded disease even though the inoculation itself kills seven millions and mutilates fifteen millions more? Shall it seek to cast out Satan by the use of Satan's weapons?

The world's only hope is for the Church to follow Jesus' method of aggressive goodwill in the face of tyranny and oppression. This will involve danger, and for some it may mean death, as in the case of the Master Himself. The day has come when it is imperative that the Church should sound a new note of heroic and sacrificial devotion to the principle of the cross.

The Church should be made to feel deeply penitent when it realize that there is no single good that results from war that could not be better achieved in another way. We speak

of courage and bravery: does war create these virtues or simply bring to the surface capacities that have long remained dormant? We speak of devotion and sacrifice: are they the offspring of war or are they simply released by the call of country? The Church should be shamed at the very thought of its failure to sound a challenge sufficiently clear and convincing to bring forth these qualities in a far nobler cause. We have the challenge: our failure is in not sounding it. "Away then", said Channing, "With the argument that war is needed as a nursery of patriotism. The school of the peaceful Redeemer is infinitely more adapted to teach the nobler as well as the milder virtues which adorn humanity."

To be willing to surrender life for others is an ennobling attitude, but to be willing to take the life of another can never be so. Indeed to take the lives of those whom we acknowledge to be sons of God must always involve an element of sacrilege. Actual warfare does not only appeal to the greater instincts of man, it lets loose also his basest passions. "It is exciting to destroy life at the risk of one's own: but it is not less exhilarating, and may involve much greater danger, to rescue life at the risk of one's own. It is brave to be a soldier; but it may be much braver to be a savior. It takes courage to conquer savages with the sword, but it takes more courage to conquer savages without the sword. It is heroic to lead a charge in battle: but it is more heroic to let a mosquito settle on one's hand to die of yellow fever that a world may be delivered from a scourge more terrible than war. No soldier daring was ever greater than many a modern exploit of medical research or missionary zeal."¹

When we come to the question of self sacrifice, does not the greatest of all challenges come from the Master? Can the challenge of any nation equal His ringing call: "If any ~~man~~ would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me"? "Behold I send you forth as sheep among

¹ Professor Peabody.

wolves." "The hour cometh that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service to God." "And ye shall be my witnesses." Truly the call of the Christ is a summon to adventure and to sacrifice.

There has never been a day when the world was more ready and eager to respond to a call to adventure and sacrifice. This is the hour of the Church's supreme opportunity. In all history there has been such a tide of unselfishness and sacrifice as this generation is witnessing. Tens upon tens of thousands of men and women have learned to forget self and to live or die for others. Out of the countless numbers of instances that might be given, as concrete examples of what we mean, we quote from the story of a young soldier of France:

"Young as he was - barely nineteen - he looked upon the France of 1914 not as she was - but as she might one day be. With the clear vision of the soldier-mystic and the soldier-lover, he beheld the ideal France, the France of tomorrow, rising renewed and purified from the ashes of the war. For that France he not only laid down his life, with all its gifts and promises, but poured out his soul, praying only that whatever of spiritual force might have dwelt in him, should by his death flow out and inspire all who had shared his own efforts and ideals." One cannot fail to be touched by the words of a letter written to his mother just before his death: "I know with an unalterable confidence that the foundation of my faith is unshakeable, it rests upon the Rock. I shall fight with a good conscience and without fear, certainly without hate. We must search our hearts to see whether we can fight; whether they are sufficiently emptied of hatred for us to fight without animosity, whether they are throbbing with such love that we can fight for others, and not merely to save our own skins. I feel myself filled with an illimitable hope. You can have no idea of the peace in which I live. On the march I sing inwardly. I listen to the music that is slumbering within me. The Master's call is always

ringing louder in my ears. I am not afraid of death. I have made the sacrifice of my life. I know that to die is to begin to live."¹

Countless numbers of young men who went out to the front with this same spirit will be coming back home within a few months or years. They will be ready to respond to a call that demands everything. In the way of the cross the Church has that challenge. Will she sound it and live it? Upon the answer to this question depends the progress of the Kingdom of God. There is no longer any question as to the dormant capacity for heroism and sacrifice in every life. A flood of it has been released during these terrible months. May the Church sound a call that is sufficiently challenging to draw these heroic souls into the service of the Kingdom, and thus conserve and deepen this sorely needed spirit of unselfish devotion to high ideals.

The call to follow the way of the cross is the supreme challenge of all ages. If taught and lived without compromise it will continue to be the most active, dynamic and powerful way known to mankind. The propagation of the spirit of the cross is the supreme task of the Church.

(c) Have Faith. It still remains true that without faith it is impossible to please God. Not until ^{it} she has supreme faith in God, in mankind, and in the way of the cross, can the Church hope to bring about the abolition of war. The whole progress of the Kingdom of God depends upon faith.

We will do well in this hour to notice again Jesus' trust in God. Never was a truer saying made by one's enemies: "He trusted on God". Surely all will agree with Dr. Jefferson, as he says: "If you were to ask me what is deepest and most fundamental in the character of Jesus, I should say it was His trust in God. It was the heaven above His head, the earth beneath His feet, the atmosphere He daily breathed, the spirit in which He was saturated, the music that ran through all His conversation, the inspiration of all His life. To trust in the

¹

"A Young Soldier of France."

goodness and mercy of the good Father was His own intensest delight; to induce others to trust in Him was also His constant ambition and endeavor. He was persecuted as no other man before His day or since; He was maligned, abused, execrated. Men called Him crazy, others said He was a devil. He was accused of blasphemy, of treason - but His heart remained sweet. Men buffeted Him and abused Him, hissing at Him their ingratitude and hatred. And then finally He failed. Injustice was stronger than justice, unrighteousness was mightier than righteousness, hate was stronger than love. He had tried to induce the world to accept a beautiful truth, but the world spurned Him. In the hour of His great defeat He still looked on God, saying 'Not my will, but Thine be done.' Defeat itself could not make him draw back."¹

We need Jesus' trust in God, and we need also His faith in men. The Master knew the sins and weaknesses of men in a unique way. Still He had an unshakeable confidence in them. Jesus never failed to see the rough exterior, but He differs from most of us, in that He goes deeper and sees a heart buried beneath the crust of sin. He sees a soul created in the Father's image; He has visions of the hidden feelings, latent energies, unrevealed possibilities and boundless capacities that may be released by the touch of love. Where others see only passion and depravity, He sees aspiration and godlikeness. With deep insight Michael Angelo says: "There is an angel in that marble: it is my business to get it out." Would that the Church of Jesus Christ had the vision to see angels in men and would put forth every effort to bring them into expression. There has never been a day when this spirit of confidence in mankind was more needed than in our generation. The world is filled with hatred and suspicion, and the times demand that the Church shall lead out into a new era of trust and cooperation.

It is equally imperative that the Church shall have faith in the cross as the supreme way of life. Following in the

¹ Chas. E. Jefferson, "The Character of Jesus", p. 135-143.

steps of the Master, she should stake all upon the principle of unselfish service and vicarious sacrifice, and should have confidence in the final triumph of the highest ideal, the reign of love.

While it must be admitted that throughout the centuries the term "idealist" has been more often used to express scorn than praise and has been more often considered a sign of weakness than strength, surely all will agree with Professor Peabody, as he says: "When one surveys the history of moral progress, what does it teach but the justification of idealism? What is it that has created a better world but the antecedent faith of the idealists? Each reform in industrial conditions, in the protection of the unprotected, in the abolition of slavery, whether it be chattel or commercial slavery - in the treatment of the criminal and the prisoner, has been first dreamed and then accomplished. First comes the idealist with his impracticable hope, and then follow the legislatures and the nations with their practical measures."¹ Even the great military genius Napoleon said: "Do you know what I most admire in the world? It is the powerlessness of material force. Sooner or later, the sword is conquered by the idea."²

The world sorely needs Christian idealists today; men who will follow the way of the cross with the same recklessness with which the soldier serves his country; men who have learned to count all things less for Christ's sake, and who will follow His way of life without qualification or compromise; men who are equally ready to live or to die for the Kingdom of Redeeming Love. What is demanded is that Christians in so-called civilized lands shall have the same faith, the same passion for souls, the same sacrificial spirit that dominates the pioneer missionaries in the lonely places of the earth.

At a time when it is being repeatedly said that the only adequate means of resisting armed men is by the use of similar weapons, and when it is contended that the principle of

¹ "Jesus Christ and Christian Character", p. 229, 230.
² quoted by E. A. Burroughs, in The Valley of Decision

redeeming love is utterly helpless in the face of aroused feelings and inflamed passions; how refreshing and inspiring it is to hear of marvelous victories over lawless and dangerous men, won by the sole means of love.

On January 13, 1915, the body of the daughter of a drunken Scotch shoemaker was placed in a simple coffin at Itu, in far away Nigeria, on the west coast of Africa. "There the mourners gathered. Government officials, merchants, and missionaries, were all there. Policemen were posted in the streets; all flags flew at half-mast, and the town was hushed and still. Great crowds watched the procession, which moved along in ~~silence~~. The coffin was draped with the Union Jack, and carried shoulder high by the boat boys, ~~who wore black singlets and mourning loin-cloths, but no caps.~~ The Governor General of Nigeria telegraphed his deepest regret at the news of her death."¹

For thirty-nine years, Mary Slessor of Calabar had lived and labored among these savage people, considered to be the most degraded of any in Africa. "Bloody, savage, crafty, cruel, treacherous, sensual, devilish, thievish, cannibals, fetish-worshippers, murderers, were a few of the epithets applied to them by men accustomed to observe closely and to weigh their words." "What a land was this she had chosen to make her dwelling-place - a land ~~of~~ formless, mysterious, terrible, ruled by witchcraft and the terrorism of secret bodies; where the skull was worshipped and blood-sacrifices were offered to jujus; where guilt was decided by ordeal of poison and boiling oil; where scores of people were murdered when a chief died, and his wives decked themselves in finery and were strangled to keep him company in the spirit-land; where men and women were bound and left to perish by the water-side to placate the god of shrimps; where the alligators were satiated with feeding on human flesh; where twins were done to death, and the mother banished to the bush; where semi-nakedness was compulsory, and the girls were sent to farms to be fattened for marriage. A land, also, of

¹ "Mary Slessor of Calabar" by W. P. Livingstone.

disease and fever and white graves."

"And there still a slave market was held, and along the upper border of the Creek human sacrifice and cannibalism were practiced. Only recently a chief had died, and sixty slave people were killed and eaten. One day twenty-five were set in a row with their hands tied behind them, and a man came and with a knife chopped off their heads."

For months at a time Mary Slessor lived alone among these warring peoples. Again and again she was faced with death. From the many such instances recorded by her biographer, we choose two or three concrete examples: "The crowd became angry and excited; they surged around her. Threats were shouted, guns and swords were waved, and the position grew critical, but she stood her ground, quiet and cool and patient. The noise and confusion calmed down, and ultimately it was decided to spare the man's life. She had won her first victory."

"Mad with drink the chief was clinging to a bag which the women were endeavoring to seize. He was hitting out at them with his heavy hand, and most of them were bleeding. Quietly, firmly, persistently, she demanded the bag. He threw it at her. Opening it she found palm-nuts and cartridges. For a moment she looked foolish, but diving deeper she pulled out no fewer than forty of the deadly beans. 'I'll take the liberty of keeping these', she said coolly, but with a swiftly beating heart. 'No, no', he shouted, and his followers joined him in protest. Outwardly calm, she walked between the lines of armed men, ironically bidding them take the bag from her. But their hands were held, and she passed safely through, reached her hut, handed the beans to Mr. Owens, and returned to the scene to pacify the crowd."

"A hundred yards from the village of the enemy she came upon the band in the bush making preparations for attack; the war-fever was at its height, and the air resounded with wild yells. Walking quietly forward she addressed them as one would

speak to schoolboys, telling them to hold their peace and behave like men and not like fools. Passing on to the village she encountered a solid wall of armed men. Giving them greeting, she got no reply. The silence was ominous. Twitting them on their perfect manners she went up to them, and was about to force a passage. Then a strange thing happened. From out of the sullen line of dark-skinned warriors there stepped an old man, who came and knelt at her feet. "We thank you for coming. We admit the wounding of the chief. We beg of you to use your influence with the injured party in the interests of peace." The next few hours witnessed scenes of wild excitement, rising sometimes to frenzy. Bands of men kept advancing from both sides and joining in the palaver, and every arrival increased the indignation and the resolution to abide by the old, manlier way of war. She was well-nigh worn out, but her wonderful patience and tact, coupled with her knowledge of all the outs and ins of their character, again won her the victory. It was agreed that a fine should settle the quarrel. Even then the men declared that they were ashamed to return 'like women', without having fought. They begged her to allow them to have a 'small scrap' in order to prove they were not cowards. Not till they were safely past the danger zone did she leave them."

"Never in all her dealings with the tribes was she molested in any way. Once only, in a compound brawl, in which she intervened, was she struck, but the native who wielded the stick had touched her accidentally. The cry immediately went up that 'Ma' was hurt, and both sides fell on the wretched man, and would have killed him had she not gone to the rescue."

After some years of labor among these people, this modest little woman in her annual report used these words:

"Raiding, plundering, the stealing of slaves have almost entirely ceased. For fully a year we have heard of nothing like violence from even the most backward of our people. It seemed sometimes to be almost miraculous that hordes of armed, drunken, passion-

swayed men should give heed and chivalrous homage to a woman, and one who had neither wealth nor outward display of any kind to produce the slightest sentiment in her favor. But such was the case, and we do not recollect one instance of insubordination. No tribe was formerly so feared because of their utter disregard of human life, but human life is now safe." "Her fame had gone far, and people came from places a hundred miles distant to see the wonderful person who was ruling the land and doing away with all the evil fashions, and what did they see? A powerful Sultana sitting in a palace with an army at her command? No, only a weak woman in a lowly louse, surrounded by a number of helpless children. But they, too, came under her mysterious spell."

In achieving all of these marvelous results, Mary Slessor used the most revolutionary and dynamic method known to men: faith was her armor and love her only weapon. "If I have done anything in my life", she said on one occasion, "it has been easy because the Master has gone before." "It was by surrender, dedication, and unwearied devotion that she grew into her power of attainment, and all can adventure on the same path. It was love for Christ that made her what she was, and there is no limit set in that direction. Many influences move men and women to beautiful and gallant deeds, but what Mary Slessor was, and what she did, affords one more proof that the greatest of these is Love."

Just in proportion as the Church is dominated by this same spirit of absolute faith in God and in the principle of Calvary, and this same willingness to surrender all and to stake everything upon His way of life, will she receive power to overcome oppression and to bring about Justice, Righteousness and Redemption among the sons of men.

If a Livingstone can conquer the savages of the interior, a Penn can master the Redskins of the forest, and a Slessor can win the affection and obedience of the cannibals of

the jungle, by the sole means of confidence and love, have we not reason to believe that the more refined and cultured enemy could be humbled by this same method? If Jesus by the one principle of redeeming love has claimed the allegiance of millions of human beings of all races and conditions for nineteen centuries, shall we not insist that His method is the supreme way of life?

Loyalty to the Master Jesus demands that the Church shall refuse utterly to sanction the sword and shall place supreme reliance in the cross.